15

EXEMYΘIA;
Roman Oracles Silenced:
OR, THE
Prime Testimonies
OF
ANTIQUITY
Produced by
HENRY TURBERVIL
IN HIS
Manual of Controversies
Examined and Refuted.

By the Right Reverend
Dr. *WILLIAM THOMAS*, late Lord
Bishop of *WORCESTER*.

Imprimatur,
Jan. 20. 1691. *Z. Isham.*
R.P.D. *Henrico*
Episc. *Lond.* a Sacris.

LONDON,
Printed by *J. R.* and are to be Sold at the *Crown* in *Cornhil*, near the *Stocks-Market*. MDCXCI.

Manual of Controversies

By the Right Reverend

Dr. WILLIAM THOMAS, late Lord

Bishop of WORCESTER.

To the Reader.

THE *Publishing of this small Tract,* (opus posthumum & imperfectum) *may need an Apology, as wanting the last Hand of the Accurate Author, and Answering but to the Six first Leaves of the Manual it attacks: But since 'tis a Genuine Copy, compared as near as could be with the obscurely written Original, And it sufficiently unravels the Testimonies of the First Six Hundred Years, of which the* Romanists *mainly Vaunt, and to which the Reformed confidently Appeal; It may pass for a just Treatise without Disappointment to the Reader, or Derogation to the Authors Name, whose Memory is Venerable and Pretious with those that knew Him; Being a Person* τάπεινῷ τῷ φρονήματι, *of singular Modesty and Humility to conquer Passion, and win Affection; yet* ὑψηλῷ τοῖς ἔργοις, *of Conspicuous* Greg. Naz.

spicuous Learning and Life to convince Gainsayers, and confound Adversaries: An Instance both of his Candour and Dexterity Herein we have in his former Apology for our Church against the Cavils of Separatists, and in this Present Answer to the Challenge of Romanists. *In both which he hath approved Himself a Workman that need not be ashamed, whose unbyassed Judgment, and steady Hand carry an Equal Poise, without Prejudice and Partiality. Who had not learned μὴ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύειν, to fit his Faith to the Times; But as a faithful Soldier and Martyr stood fast in the Truth of the Church of* England, *kept his standing* contra Homines & Daemones, *No Temptation could warp or*
Cl. Al. *divert Him μεχρὶ αἱματος to the last Gasp. May His Sincerity and Constancy be to us a lasting ὑπομνηστικον to Encourage and Establish us in the Present Truth.*

A Manual

A MANUAL OF CONTROVERSIES.

ARTICLE I.

The TENET.

THAT the Church now in Communion with the See of *Rome*, is the only True Church.

The ARGUMENT.

That is the only True Church of God, which hath had a continued Succession from Christ and his Apostles to this time.

But the Church now in Communion with the See of Rome, *and no other, hath had a continued Succession from Christ and his Apostles to this time.*

Therefore the Church now in Communion with the See of Rome, *and no other, is the True Church of God.*

W. T. The *Major* is not true, unless there be an addition of a word *only*, to wit, which only hath had a continued succession from Christ.

Non colligi necessariò esse ecclesiam ubi est successio.

Bellarm. l. 4. *de Eccl.* c. 8. The *Major* being thus propounded, is not of validity in the judgment of *Bellarmine*, who will not admit succession to be a proof of the true Church.

The *Major* is to be denyed if understood of a Local, Personal, without a Doctrinal Succession.

H. T. *The* Major *proved*, *Isa.* 59. 21. *Isa.* 60. 1, 3, 11. *Isa.* 62. 6. *Ezek.* 37. 26. *Dan.* 7. 13, 14. *St. Matth.* 28. 20. *St. John* 14. 16. *Eph.* 4. 11, 12, 13, 14.

W. T. These Texts of Scripture import the Conversion of the *Gentiles*, the propagation of the Gospel, the Divine assistance to be continued to the Church in the most diffusive Capacity, without a particular restriction to any distinct place or People. A discussion whereof were a digression not pertinent to the main of our Controversie.

The *Minor* Proposition exacts a closer Examination.

This Proposition hath two Members, the one positive; The Church now in Communion with the See of *Rome*, hath had a continued Succession from Christ and his Apostles.

The other Member is negative; No other Church hath had a continued Succession from Christ and his Apostles.

The *minor* Proposition is impotent in both the parts, like *Mephiboseth*, lame in both feet.

There is no Confirmation offered as to the latter branch that excludes other Churches from the plea of Succession. Whereas the Local, Personal Succession of the Churches of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Jerusalem*, and others is flourishing out in specious Catalogues less liable to exception than that of *Rome*, which is yet more transcended in a Doctrinal succession if reduced to the Sacred Test of Canonical Scripture.

H. T. *The minor Proposition is proved by this ensuing Catalogue of the* Roman *Churches chief Pastors, Councils, Nations Converted, and Publick Professors of her Faith.*

From

From the Year of Christ, Thirty.

Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
30 *Our Blessed Saviour,* Jesus Christ.	*The Council of the Apostles at* Jerusalem, *St.* Peter *presiding,* Acts 15.
34 *St.* Peter *the Apostle.*	
67 Linus.	
80 Cletus.	
93 Clement.	

W. T. What is asserted of Concoction of Meats is appliable to this point of succession in the See of *Rome*. An Error in the first degree is not to be corrected in the rest. If the first link be loose, all will be shatter'd. There is no certainty because there is no harmony in the Testimonies of Antiquity, touching the first, second, third, and fourth Bishops of *Rome*.

Rufinus relates that *Linus* and *Cletus* were not distinct Successors after the dissolution of St. *Peter*, but joint Bishops during his Life; that they discharged the Episcopal Office whilst he did the Apostolical.

Linus & Clerus *fuerunt quidem ante* Clementem *Episcopi in urbe* Roma; *Sed superstite* Petro: *videlicet ut illi Episcopatus curam gererent, ipse vero Apostolatus officium impleret. Rufinus* Præfat. ad libros recognitionum.

Epiphanius gives this account of the Succession in the See of *Rome*. *Peter* and *Paul*. *Linus*. *Cletus*.

Epiphanius, Hæres. 27.

Tertullian lays the Foundation of the See of *Rome* in both the Apostles recited.

A gloriosissimis Apostolis Petro & Paulo Romæ *fundatur & constituitur Ecclesia.* Tertul. *adv.* Mani. l. 4.

Irenæus testifies, that both invested *Linus* in the Bishoprick of *Rome*.

Fundantes & instruentes Ecclesiam, Lino *Episcopatum tradiderunt.* Iræn. l. 3. c. 8.

St. *Clemens* makes himself the immediate Successor of St. *Peter*.

Clem. *in Epist.* 1. *ad* Jacobum.

* *Tertullian* ratifies this Order of Succession.

* Tertull. *in* l. *de præscript.* cap. 32.

Irenæus and † *Eusebius* recite *Anacletus* for the immediate Successor of *Linus*.

Iræn. l. 3. c. 3. † Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* l. 3. c. 13.

Ign. in Epiſt. ad Mar. Caſtobol. * Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

St. *Ignatius* and * St. *Irenæus* recount *Anacletus* as Predeceſſor to *Clemens*.

† Bar. ad *Ann. inſtit.* 69. Sect. 39.

Baronius † vindicates this to be the true Succeſſion. I ſhall not hence conclude your forementioned, not conſiſtent with this to be falſe, being countenanced by the Authority of St. *Optatus* ‖ and others. But I may hence infer how little Weight and Streſs there is in your firſt Evidence produced for Succeſſion in the See of *Rome*: In oppoſition to all theſe Records * *Clemens* in pretended Recognitions in his name avouches St. *Barnabas* to be the firſt Planter of the Church.

‖ Opt. l. 3. *contra* Parmen.

* Clem. in l. 10. *recognitionum.* Euſeb. *Chron.* p. 566.

Your next Argument is the Council of the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem*, St. *Peter* preſiding, *Acts* 15. The diſcuſſion of this Objection may properly be referred to the next Section, becauſe it is there more dilated, and improved by the Opponent.

H. T. *From the Year* 100.

103 Anacletus.
112 Evariſtus.
121 Alexander.
132 Sixtus I.
142 Teleſphorus.
154 Higinus.
158 Pius I.
163 Anicetus.
175 Soter.
179 Eleutherius.
194 Victor.

Tullius l. 1. *de Inventione.*

W. T. The great *Roman Orator* juſtly ſet a brand of Infamy on a Common Argument, that may reciprocally be uſed by both Parties in *Controverſies*. It is yet more

lyable

lyable to exception, when that proof which is falſely produced is truly retorted.

We willingly ſubmit to the Teſt of theſe recited Biſhops of *Rome*, who lived Saints, and moſt of them dyed Martyrs, whoſe Doctrine we own and embrace as true and orthodox, whoſe practice (Humane Infirmities excepted) we eſtimate as meet patterns to be imitated; whereas both have been notoriouſly ſcandalouſly receded from by pretended Succeſſors in the See of *Rome* for at leaſt eleven Centuries laſt paſt.

H. T. *In this firſt Age or Century after Jeſus Chriſt, we find the Primacy in St.* Peter, *as is manifeſt by the ſaid Council in the Acts, where (after a ſerious debate, whether the* Jewiſh *Ceremonies ought to be impoſed on the* Gentiles,) *St.* Peter *defined in the negative.* Acts 15. 7, 8, 9, 10.

W. T. St. *Peter* declared, (*v.* 14.) but defined not. He ſpake not firſt authoritatively, to lead, nor laſt juridically, to ratifie.

Not firſt, untruly alledged by *Bellarmine*, there had been much diſputing before, (*v.* 7.) much arguing among the Judges, according to the ordinary gloſs.

Cum multa, diſceptatio fuiſſet inter Judices Gl. Ord.

Not laſt, this priviledge, this preheminence appertained to St. *James*, as Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*. Therefore he ſpeaks laſt.

Ἐπίσκοπος ἦν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας ἦτοι, διὸ καὶ ὕστερος λαλεῖ. Chryſ.

It is the Reaſon offered by St. *Chryſoſtome* and St. *Theophilact*.

Ἐπίσκοπος ἦν ἦτοι. διὸ ὕστερον λέγει. Theopn.

St. *Peter* had a ſpecial occaſion of an Hiſtorical Narrative touching the *Gentile* Converſion, as alſo St. *Paul* and St. *Barnabas* had, but neither did pronounce Juridical Sentence.

No mean Romaniſts had ſo much ingenuity as to acknowledge that all the reſt of Apoſtles, even St. *Peter* not excepted, did vail to the Juriſdiction of St. *James*, whilſt he preſided at *Jeruſalem*.

Abuleus in c. 7. Matth. qu. 13. Dionyſ. Carth. in Act. 13. Lorin. in Act. 15.

H. T.

H. T. *St.* James, *(who was Biſhop of the place) ſeconding by his Sentence what* Peter *had decreed, all the Multitude (ſaith* Jerome*) held their Peace; and into his (*Peters*) Sentence,* James *the Apoſtle and all the Prieſts did paſs together.* Ep. 89. *to* Auguſt. c. 2. Peter *(ſaith he, in the ſame place) was Prince and Author of the Decree.*

Beatus Jacobus *cum cæteris Apoſtolis tale decretum conſtituit obſervandum.* Gaudent. in Serm. de Macchab.

W. T. It was St. *Peters* preparatory Sentence or Opinion; but St. *James* ultimate Decree, final Determination aſſiſted with the reſt of the Apoſtles: So *Gaudentius* hath exactly expreſt it.

The Teſtimony of St. *Jerome* recited, conſiſts in two phraſes. The one is, *St.* James *and the reſt paſſing into the Sentence of* Peter. Which imports no more, but that what was aſſerted by St. *Peter* was approved by St. *James* and the reſt.

The *Nicene* Council did aſſent to the Opinion, acquieſce in the Judgment of the Famous *Paphnutius*; yet did he not preſide in that Council.

The ſecond quoted expreſſion of St. *Jerome*, is, *that St.* Peter *was Prince and Author of the Decree.* This denotes a precedence of time in uttering his Opinion before thoſe recounted afterwards, not a preheminence of place of office above them in eſtabliſhing that Opinion.

Princeps rogationis Fabritius. Cicero in Orat. pro Sextio.

This is not inconſiſtent with the ſignificancy of Prince in *Cicero's* ſtile: That it cannot be underſtood in a notion of dignity of Principality, is evident in the Conſtitution or Decree its ſelf, pronounced by St. *James*, which contained ſome Subjects not mentioned by St. *Peter.*

To abſtain from pollutions of Idols, and from Fornication, and from things Strangled, and from Blood.

H. T. *That St.* Peter *tranſlated his Chair from* Antioch *to* Rome, *is proved.*

Firſt, *Becauſe he remained not always at* Antioch, *as all that Church acknowledgeth; nor did ſhe challenge the firſt*

first Chair in any General Council, as appears in the Councils.

Secondly, *By the Decrees of Councils, Popes, and other Fathers, giving the Primacy to the* Roman *Church.*

W. T. It is a looſe Illogical Inference. St. *Peter* remained not always at *Antioch*, therefore he tranſlated his Chair to *Rome*. He might exerciſe his Apoſtolical Function in both Churches, and yet poſſibly diſcharge a diſtinct Epiſcopal Office in neither.

During his abſence from *Antioch*, he was at *Jeruſalem*, at *Alexandria*, at *Babylon*. He ſpent ſome years at *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, but it cannot be thence concluded, nor is it aſſerted, that he fixed a Pontifical Chair in either.

As to the ſucceſſion of St. *Peter*, *Antioch* had at leaſt as much right to challenge the firſt Chair in a General Council as *Rome*.

St. *Paul* was at *Rome*, at *Corinth*, at *Athens*, at *Epheſus*, at *Philippi*. He was an Apoſtle in each place, (properly) a Biſhop in neither.

As to your ſecond allegation of the *Decrees of Councils, Popes, Fathers, giving Primacy to the* Roman *Church*: This is ſpecious, pompous in appearance; but is not ſolid, vigorous in force.

Latet dolus in generalibus. A Generality is the fitteſt Dreſs and Vail for a Fallacy.

As for the firſt Chair in a General Council, (the point of Primacy ſpecified) no Antient, General, or National, or Provincial Council hath aſſigned it to the Pope.

I confeſs, the *Laterane* Council, under *Leo* the 10th, hath ſo eſtabliſht it; but that was in the year 1516. The Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* allow it not. Conſtan. Conc. Seſſ. 4. & 5. Baſil. Seſſ. 2. & 16.

As for the pretended Decrees of Popes in their own concern of Power and Grandeur, they are of little validity. By the Canon Law, the Pope cannot be Judge in his own Cauſe. It were irrational and preſumptuous to exact it. *Papa non debet eſſe Judex in propria cauſa.* 26. q. 6. *conſuetudo.*

The firſt Chair in General Councils hath been ſometimes

times arbitrarily granted to the Pope in the Primitive Church, and ſometimes to other Patriarchs.

That there hath been no ancient conceſſion, no conſtant uninterrupted Preſcription for it, appears in the Records of the firſt Council of *Nice*, the *Sardian* Council, the firſt and ſecond *Conſtantinopolitan*, the firſt and ſecond *Epheſine*.

Turre cremat. ſum. de Eccl. l. 3. c. 13. Whenever the Pope had the prime Chair in any General Council anciently, it was only Honorary for Seſſion, for Diſtinction; not Authoritative, for Juriſdiction.

H. T. *The Council of* Sardis, Anno Dom. 400, (Weſtern Fathers 300. Eaſt. 76.) *decreed, That in caſes of Biſhops, for the honour of St.* Peters *memory, it ſhould be Lawful to appeal from whatſoever other Biſhop to the Biſhop of* Rome. Can. 3.

W. T. I offer ſeveral exceptions for the empairing the validity of this Teſtimony.

Firſt, I deny this to be a General Council. If it were, it ought to be ſorted the ſecond General Council next to the *Nicene*, before the firſt *Conſtantinopolitan*.

You alledge the confluence of 300 *Weſtern*, 76 *Eaſtern* Fathers. If it had been ſo, it had been a great diſproportion betwixt the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Prelates, and a grand advantage to promote the Papal Dignity.

There is a mixture of Truth and Falſhood in the citation of this Authority. (*Omnis fabula fundatur in Hiſtoria.*) An Oecumenical Council it was in the intention, the deſign of the Emperor, but not in the execution, the management of the Council. In the one reſpect it hath been anciently called a General, in the other a Particular Council.

Both the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Fathers were Summoned by Imperial Edict, in Obedience whereto, both repaired to *Sardis*: But they conſulted nor convened not together, (upon a difference touching St. *Athanaſius* and *Paulus*). The *Eaſtern* receded from *Sardis*, and held a Council apart at *Philippi* in *Thracia*.

Socrat. l. 2. c. 16.

Sozom. l. 3. c. 10.

The

The *Weſtern* Prelates that remained apart at *Sardis*, could not conſtitute a General Council, nor obtrude a Canon to bind any out of the *Weſtern* Limits.

My ſecond exception is againſt the Canon its ſelf produced, which hath a ſuſpitious taint of impoſture, being not received, not after the utmoſt ſcrutiny to be found, by the *African* Fathers, as not extant in the *Nicene* Council, ſo not in any other.

Nec in aliqua Patrum Synodo. Con. Afric. c. 105.

St. *Auſtin* was utterly ignorant of any ſuch Canon, who was not unverſt in a point of Juriſdiction and Preheminence, ſo much diſcuſs'd in his time.

Ut aliqui tanquam à tuæ ſanctitatis latere mittantur nullâ invenimus Patrum Synodo conſtitutum. Aug. in ep. ad Cœleſtin.

St. *Auſtin* acknowledged no *Sardian* Council but what was Heretical.

Aug. contra Creſcen. l. 3. c. 34.

The Cardinal *Cuſanus* had ſo much ingenuity, as to acknowledge a ſufficient ground of doubt, whether there be extant a Conſtitution of the *Sardian* Council.

Satis poſſe dubitari an Sardienſis *Concilii conſtitutio exiſtat.* Cuſan. de Conc. Catho. l. 2. c. 25.

The *Sardian* Canon quoted, is the more obnoxious to the impeachment of fraud, becauſe it is repugnant to the fifth Canon of the *Nicene* Council; for which the Orthodox Fathers of that Age had a moſt ſolemn veneration.

The firſt who inſerted this Canon (to give it luſtre) into the famous Univerſal Code, together with the reſt of the *Sardian* Council, was *Dionyſius Exiguus*, in the year 525. who acted the Advocate and Sophiſter to advance the Papal Intereſt, being an Abbot of *Rome*, who in his Tranſlation of the Code out of Greek into Latin, notoriouſly ſhuffled; as by addition of the *Sardian* pretended Canons, and thoſe called the Canons of the Apoſtles; ſo alſo by ſubſtraction of the eight Canons of the Council of *Epheſus*, the three laſt Canons of the firſt *Conſtantinopolitan* Council, the two laſt of *Chalcedon*, and of a Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*.

My third exception is, That the Canon recited, being indulged to paſs as genuine and authentique, (*Dato non conceſſo*) yet will it not ſupport the weight of a due,

εἰ δοκεῖ ὑμῖν πῃ ἀγάτῃ πέτρου τὴν μνήμην τιμήσωμεν.

τοῖς ἀγχιστεύουσι τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ.

durable, staple appeal to the Bishop of *Rome*. It is softly and warily propounded by *Hosius*: *If it please you let us in charity honour the memory of St.* Peter. It is the tenour of a novel singular favour, bound up with several restrictions; it put the Pope in a capacity, upon deliberation, for a review refer'd to him to nominate Commissioners (not out of *Rome*) out of the Neighbouring Province.

This might be an extraordinary esteem and reverence to *Julius*, then Bishop of *Rome*; not decreed as a constant Prerogative for succeeding Ages. If any such vigour of it be pretended, it is abrogated, annulled in the Councils of *Constantinople* and *Antioch*.

H. T. *The Council of* Chalcedon, (Anno Domini 451. *Fathers* 600.) *We thoroughly consider truly, that all Primacy and chief Honour, according to the Canons, is to be kept for the Arch-Bishop of Old* Rome. Action. 16.

W. T. I readily grant all Primacy and chief Honour to the Arch-Bishop of *Rome*, according to the genuine unforged Canons in the Primitive Church, which assert only a priority of Order before other Patriarchs, not a superiority of Power over them, much less a supremacy over Councils and Princes, vindicated by Modern Canonists, by the Jesuits, the neat Sophisters of the Church, the smooth Parasites of the Court of *Rome*.

Si cum ipsius Provinciæ Metropolitano Episcopus vel Clericus controversiam habeat, Diœcesis exarchum adeat vel Imperatoriæ Urbis Constantinopolis *Thronum, et apud eum litiget.* Conc. Chal. c. 9.

If *H. T.* be an Advocate for the former primacy I oppose him not; if for the latter, either his advertency or ingenuity is defective, in urging the Council of *Chalcedon*, the transactions whereof are abundantly repugnant to this pretended preheminence. It directly clashes with the ninth Canon of that Council.

The fallacy in citing of the Testimony of the Council of *Chalcedon*, is unmasked in the immediate subsequent words,

words, which aſcribes the ſame Primacy and Honour to the Arch-Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*.

This equality of Dignity of New *Rome* with the Old was paſſionately reſented, vigorouſly oppoſed, but ineffectually unſucceſsfully by the Legates of the Pope.

Upon whoſe diſſatisfaction there was a Recognition, a new deliberate diſcuſſion of the Canon.

After which it was more ſolemnly ratified, with an univerſal, reiterated, declared conſent.

Leo, then Biſhop of *Rome*, atteſted the reality of this Degree, even whilſt in ſeveral Epiſtles he expreſt his diſguſt of it. Leo *in Ep. ad* Anatol. *& in Ep. ad* Pulcher.

The Hiſtories of *Socrates* and *Sozomen* punctually record it. Socr. l. 5. c. 7. Soz. l. 7. c. 9.

This Council of *Chalcedon* communicates equal priviledges to the moſt Holy Throne of New *Rome* with the Elder; being honoured both with Empire and Senate, no leſs than ſhe to be extolled and magnified as her ſecond, or next to her. Τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπονέμεται τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ. Conc. Chalc. Can. 28.

Though this be perfidiouſly omitted in her *Roman* Edition, yet it is inſerted in all *Greek* Copies, and retained in the antient *Latin* Copies, extant in Libraries.

The ſubſtance of this conſtitution is eſtabliſht in the *Epheſine* and *Trullan* Councils. Epheſ. Conc. can. 9. Trull. Conc. can. 36.

H. T. *In the relation of the ſaid Council to Pope* Leo. *We have confirmed, ſay they, the rule of the One Hundred and Fifty Fathers, in the firſt* Conſtantinopolitan *Council*, Anno 381. *which hath commanded, that after the moſt Holy and Apoſtolick See of* Rome, *the* Conſtantinopolitan *ſhould have Honour.*

W. T. That relation hath been taxed for a colluſion. A late figment out of the *Colonian* Library. *E Bibliotheca* Colonienſium *Prædicatorum non ita pridem Edita, per Dom. Pr. in præf.*

But ſuppoſing it were no fiction, what advantage can hence accrew to the *Roman* See more than is already granted?

If there be any colour for an Argument, it muſt be

from the Epithets, *moſt Holy and Apoſtolick*, or inſerting the See of *Conſtantinople* in a ſeeming inferiour rank to that of *Rome*.

Epithets are no Charters for Prerogatives: The complemental Rhetorick of a Title is no firm Topick to prove a real preheminence.

Theſe Epithets are frequently applyed to other Patriarchs, and ſometimes to inferiour Prelates in the Primitive Church. The Records of Antiquity abound in inſtances, which if required, ſhall be plentifully produced.

Tertull. *in l. de Præſcr.* Aug. *in Ep.* 162.

All thoſe Churches that have been planted by the Apoſtles, or wherein they have exerciſed their Function, have been ſtiled Apoſtolical Seats; as the Churches of *Rome*, *Antioch*, *Jeruſalem*, *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Epheſus*.

In a ſecondary Conſideration, Biſhops have been antiently termed Apoſtles, and Epiſcopacy Apoſtleſhip.

The ſecond hint of an Argument is preſumed to be from the ranking of the *Conſtantinopolitan See* after that of *Rome*. This doth not advance the power of the Juriſdiction of *Rome*, as not in the Council of *Chalcedon*, (which hath been already demonſtrated) ſo not in the Rule of the firſt *Conſtantinopolitan* recited. The expreſs Decree is in the *Latin* Tranſlation, *pari honore frui*, to enjoy a like honour; but it is more pregnant in the *Greek*; to be equally priviledged or dignified, as to a preheminence of power in Eccleſiaſtical matters alike, μεγαλυνεσθαι, to be exalted or magnified; but for precedence of place that is diſtinctly allotted in the ſame Canon to the *Roman See* before the *Conſtantinopolitan*, to the *Conſtantinopolitan* before the *Alexandrian*, and to that of *Alexandria* before *Jeruſalem*. If *Leo* the *Roman Patriark* had not been convinced, That an equality of Authority and Juriſdiction had been ſetled by that Council upon the ſeveral recited *Patriarks* in their ſeveral *Sees* and *Provinces*, he would not have been ſo much offended with that Canon of the *Chalcedon* Council before-mentioned, and buſtled againſt

Τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαβεῖν πρεσβείων Concil. Conſtant. 1. Can. 36.

it,

it, but he was ſufficiently apprehenſive that it was a check to the Tranſcendent Honour his Ambition aſpired to. Both Councils of *Conſtantinople* and *Chalcedon*, checking his deſire of ſuperlative Grandeur.

H. T. *Pope* Antherus, Anno 238, *(being asked by the Biſhop of* Bettica *and* Toletum, *Whether it were lawful for a Biſhop to be changed from one City to another) Anſwered affirmatively,* As *Peter* Prince of the Apoſtles was changed from *Antioch* to *Rome.* Decret. 7. q. 1.

W. T. There is little certainty touching the exact time and continuance of the Papacy of *Antherus*, Whether One year according to *Euſebius*, or Three according to *Volateran*, or Twelve according to *Damaſus.*) There is leſs certainty touching the ſincerity of the *Decret. Epiſtle* produced, which many have excepted againſt as ſpurious upon ſeveral accounts, among others for the barbariſm of the ſtile, the impertinence, incoherence of the concluſion, Hiſtorical Narratives touching *Euſebius* and *Felix* long after his time.

Potestatem habent Ordinare, mutare, inthronizare. Prætaxato modo

However were the Epiſtle genuine, the Title Prince of the Apoſtles is no proof of the preheminence alledged, as hath been already manifeſted. St. *Auſtin* applyed the ſame Phraſe to St. *Paul*, who was acknowledged by St. *Chryſoſtome* to be equal in Dignity with St. *Peter* (ἰσότιμος.)

Tanti Apoſtolatus Principatum meruit. Aug. Chryſ. *in* 1. Gal.

H T. *St.* Gregory *ſayes he knows no Biſhop but is ſubject to the See of* Rome, Ep. 6. 2.

W. T. St. *Gregory* (though his memory be pretious) being 600 years after Chriſt (when the Church of *Rome* declined in piety, though improved in power) hath the leſs Authentick veneration. This great Prelate being a Party, is no competent Witneſs to aſſert and vindicate the Papal prerogative.

As the Witneſs produced, ſo the Evidence it ſelf is juſtly liable to exception. That he knew none but ſubject

ject to the See of *Rome*. It must probably be limited to the bounds of his personal Acquaintance, or his Patriarchical Jurisdiction.

That it cannot be more diffusively generally understood, appears by his solemn waveing any Paternal or Magisterial power to prescribe to other Patriarks, assuming only a fraternal Candour to advise.

Verbum jussionis volo à meo auditu removere. Scio quis sum, qui essis, loco enim fratris esti moribus Patres. Non ergò jussi sed quæ utilia visa sunt indicare volui, Greg. l. 7. Ep. 30.

That St. *Gregory* was not ignorant of a Grandee who was not subject to the See of *Rome*, but challenged a higher station Ecclesiastical than himself, is abundantly manifest by his zealous resentment of the Patriark of *Constantinople* his contemporary in espousing the transcendent Title of *Universal Bishop*, not in excluding all others (as the *Romish* Champions would sophistically evade it) but in subjecting them. It is his paraphrase of this Title, *To be Inferiour to no other, to be Superior to all.*

Nulli subesse, omnibus præesse. Ep. 38 l. 7.

St. *Gregory* amply declared his abhorrence of this Title, branding it to be novel, prophane, superstitious, proud, presumptuous, an effect of Infidelity, a tincture of *Lucifer's* Apostacy, a badge of Antichrist.

Greg. l. 4. Ep. 32, 36, 38, 39.

H. T. *Catholick Professors to the year* 100, *the Blessed Virgin, St.* John Baptist, *St.* John Evangelist, *&c.* Martha, Magdalen, *St.* Paul, *St.* Stephen, Timothy, Barnabas, Terla, Dennis, Martial, Ignatius, Clemens.

W. T. They who are of sober discerning Intellectuals, cannot but disgust and nauseate this unsavoury fallacy in obtruding shells without kernels, Names without any Allegations. These are as insignificant for proof in Divinity, as Cyphers without any Figures are for account in Arithmetick; unless you design to confute as *Magicians*, to conjure by Names, to produce Spells instead of Arguments, for Enchantment, not Conviction.

Your Confidence in those venerable Saints, and your Interest also, seems to be the same with that distracted person at *Athens*, whose deluded Imaginations prompted to

to him, That all the Ships and Commodities in the Haven were his own.

H. T. *The Church was ſpread in this Age over all thoſe Countreys, to which St.* Paul *wrote his Epiſtles; as alſo* France, Spain, England, *&c. See* Baronius.

W. T. This is out of the Track of our Controverſie; That Church which was ſpread in this Age, aſſerted no other Doctrines but what are owned by the Church of *England.*

H. T. *Catholick Profeſſors to the year* 200, Euſtachius, Hermes, Getulius, Policarp, Concordius, Juſtin Martyr, Euſebius, Irenæus, Vincentius, Potentianus, Sophia, Fides, Spes, Charitas, *St.* Felicity, *with her Seven Children,* Lucius *King of* England, *&c.*

W. T. The Church of *England* doth not recede from the Religion of theſe Saints.

If you have any Inſtances to charge us with, why do you not produce their Teſtimonies? If you have none, why do you recite their Names? It is an empty pageantry of Sophiſtry: *Ad populum phaleras.*

H. T. *The Apoſtles Canons define, That if any Biſhop or Prieſt (the Oblation (Maſs) being made) ſhall not communicate, he ſhould be excommunicated, as giving ſuſpition of him, who hath ſacrificed, That he hath not rightly offered.* Can. 9. *approved in the Sixth General Synod.*

W. T. Some of the Canons ſet out in a ſpecious diſguiſe (the name of the Apoſtles) have been boggled at by eminent *Romaniſts*, among others by the Two Learned Cardinals, the accurate Sticklers for the Papal Intereſt (the one in an Hiſtorical Sphere, the other in a Controverſial,) *Baronius* and *Bellarmine.*

Baron. in Appar. verbo Clemens. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 27.

Though

Though they are ſolemnly cited, peremptorily obtruded upon others by the Modern *Romaniſts*, yet they are not exactly obſerved by themſelves: *Mich. Medina* acknowledgeth that the preſent practice doth not retain a tenth part of them in the Church of *Rome* it ſelf.

Vix ſex aut octo Latina Eccleſia nunc obſervat. Medina *de ſacra hominum* Contin. l. 5. c. 105.

The alteration and corruptions of time are the ſmooth Apologies for the familiar receſſes from theſe pretended Apoſtolical Rules.

They are branded for Apocryphal in the worſt Nations, as not received in the Catholick Church, not in the Primitive *Roman*, as compoſed by Hereticks in the judgment of *Gelaſius*, Biſhop of *Rome* (in the latter part of the Fifth Century) who excelled moſt of his Succeſſors in Piety and Literature; as alſo by the famous *Iſidor* Biſhop of *Hiſpalis* towards the cloſe of the Sixth Century.

Gratianus diſt. 15. Can. *Sancta Romana* diſtinct. 16.

Baronius vainly eſſayed to evade this latter Teſtimony, being not extant (as he alledged) in the Edition in his Library; ſince in the *Decretal* purged and refined by the Order of Pope *Gregory XIII.* It is acknowledged to be tranſmitted from the *Toletan* Library to *Rome*; which being a publick Record, having ſo ſignal a Papal Approbation, ought to be more Venerable, Authentick for credit and eſtimate, than that private Copy of a Cardinal, who himſelf confeſt, They may be ſo far deſervedly termed Apocryphal, as being deſtitute of Authority to have been entirely eſtabliſhed by the Apoſtles.

Baron. Tom. 2. *Anno Chriſti* 102. *Sect.* 11.

Quod quia Authoritate carent ab Apoſtolis iſſe omnino ſancitos Apocrypbi dici meruerunt. Bar. 16. *Notitia libr. Apocr. qui non recipiuntur.*

Whereas *Gelaſius* inſerted them among Apocryphal Books that are not received.

Gel. Decr. *in* 2. *Vol.* Concil. Edit. Nicol.

Photius the Learned *Patriark* of *Conſtantinople*, about the middle of the Ninth Century, takes the riſe of theſe Canons

Photius *in* Bibliodh. cap. 113.

Canons to be an extraction out of a tumultuous heap (ἀθροισμὸς in his phraſe) of Synodical Canons.

The firſt recital of any ſuch Canons called Apoſtolical in Genuine Antiquity, (the Teſtimony of *Zepherine* being notoriouſly ſpurious) was St. *Epiphanius* towards the end of the Fourth Century. Many Reformed Divines have by weighty Arguments unmaskt theſe Canons (which have paſſed abroad with a falſe Paſsport) not to be truly Apoſtolical.

Epiph. Hæreſ. 30. Rivet. Crit. Sacr. l. 1. c. 1. Rob. Cocus cenſ. *quorundam Script. vet.* p. 3, 4, 5, 6. Eccleſ. Hiſtor. Magdeb. Cent. 1. l. 2. cap. 7.

Among others, the Centuriſts of *Magdeburg* have offered theſe proofs.

1. They claſh with the uncontrouled, uncontradicted Apoſtolical Scriptures; (as the 17th Canon with the 1 *Tim.* 5. 1 *Cor.* 7. the 27th Canon with the 1 *Tim.* 4. 1 *Cor.* 9. 1 *Tim.* 4. Canon 68 with 1 *Tim.* 4.

2. A repugnancy with each other, jarring ſtrings not tuned to a harmony; (as the 6, 17, 27, 40, 50, 65, 68.)

3. The inconſiſtency of ſome Canons (as the 8, 20, 36, 38,) with the Hiſtorical Tranſactions of the Age of the Apoſtles.

4. They are not teſtified by any Authority of any Credit, neither in the Age of the Apoſtles, not in the firſt, the ſecond, very ſcantily in the third, that ſucceed; not in *Juſtin Martyr*, St. *Irenaus*, St. *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, *Origen*, or St. *Jerome*.

I inſiſt upon this Subject the longer, that I may, once for all, diſcover the paint and varniſh of this adulterate beauty of the Sanctuary, trickt up in the title, the dreſs of the Canons of the Apoſtles. I confeſs they have the face of Antiquity (though not entirely unblemiſht) but they have not the immediate, not the true ſtamp of the Authority of the Apoſtles, as their Authors. As for the Ninth Canon alledged, if it be of any validity, why doth the *Trentine* Council, the Oracle of the preſent Church of *Rome* run counter with it, whilſt it allows private Maſſes? If it be of no validity, why do you object what you abrogate?

Concil. Trident. Sect. 22. Can. 6.

The approbation of the Sixth General Council produced, is obnoxious to the ſame exception. If any ſtreſs may be laid upon it, why is the luſtre of it ſo ſtudiouſly, zealouſly eclipſed; Why are the Doctrines decreed ſo ſeverely impeacht, confidently doomed for erroneous, by the Grandees of your Church, by Popes, Cardinals, becauſe that Council hath allowed the Marriage of Prieſts, hath preſcribed Laws to the Church of *Rome*.

Concil. Conſtan. ſive Trull. Can. 13. & Can. 55.

If no ſtreſs may be laid on it, the objection is a confutation of it ſelf.

It is a fallacy without any grain of ingenuity to offer that for a figure to be much reckoned to us, which to your ſelves paſſeth for a Cypher of no value.

To inſpect the ſtrength of your Argument for the Second Century.

A ſingle pretended Canon of the Apoſtles not adhered to in the preſent Church of *Rome*, approved by a ſingle Canon in the Sixth General Synod, not acknowledged to be Oecumenical or Orthodox by the greateſt Champions of the preſent Church of *Rome*, hath defined that any Biſhop or Prieſt (the Oblation being made) not communicating ſhall be Excommunicated.

Therefore the Church now in Communion with the See of *Rome*, and no other, had a Succeſſion from Chriſt and the Apoſtles for the Second Century. A very looſe extravagant Inference. *Doway* or *Rome* may invent ſuch Logick, neither *Athens* nor *Alexandria* would.

From the Year of Chriſt, 200.

H. T. Chief Paſtors.

205 Zepherinus.
221 Calixtus I.
223 Pontianus.
238 Antherus.
239 Fabianus.
255 Cornelius.
255 Lucius.

257 Stephanus

257 Stephanus I.
260 Sixtus II.
261 Dionyſius I.
273 Felix I.
275 Eutychianus
284 Caius.
291 Marcellinus.

The Second and Third Ages (whether by reaſon of the Churches great Perſecutions, or the not ſtirring of any famous Hereticks) produced no Councils, yet the Succeſſion of Popes, Martyrs and Confeſſors, we have, which is ſufficient for our purpoſe.

W. T. We aſſert a more genuine Intereſt in theſe Martyrs, Confeſſors recited than your ſelves.

To ratifie, or rather to varniſh a falſe claim, you produce counterfeit Decrees of Popes.

H. T. *The Decrees of Popes in theſe Ages.*

Anacletus *decreed, That Prieſts when they ſacrifice to our Lord, muſt not do it alone, but have Witneſſes that they may be proved to have ſacrificed perfectly to God in Sacred places, and ſo the Apoſtles have appointed, and the* Roman *Church holds,* 1. Epiſt. de Conſecr. d. 1. c. Epiſcopus. *And in the end of the ſame Epiſtle, If more difficult queſtions ſhall ariſe, let them be referred to the Apoſtolick See of* Rome. *For ſo the Apoſtles have ordained by the Command of our Lord,* Anno Dom. 101.

Alexander *decreed, That Bread only, and Wine mingled with Water, ſhould be offered in the Sacrifice of the Maſs.* Epiſt. Orthod. de Conſecr. ch. 2. in Sacram.

Sixtus *decreed, That the Sacred Myſteries (the* B. Euchariſt *and Sacred Veſſels) ſhould not be touched, but by Sacred Miniſters; and that the Prieſts beginning Maſs, the People ſhould ſing, Holy, Holy, Holy,* &c. In his Epiſtle to all the faithful of Chriſt. Anno Dom. 129.

Teleſphorus *Commanded the Seven Weeks of Lent to be faſted,* Ep. Decr. Anno Dom. 139.

Pius *in his Epiſtles to the* Italians *enjoyned Penance for him, by whoſe negligence any of the Blood of our Lord ſhould be ſpilt,* 9. 1. c. qui compulſus, An. Dom. 147.

Anicetus *tells us, That* James *was made Biſhop of* Jeruſalem *by St.* Peter, James *and* John *in his* Decr. Ep. *to the Biſhop of* France, *and cites* Anacletus *for it.* Ep. 2. diſt. 25. c. prohibe fratres.

Soter *decreed, That no Man ſhould ſay Maſs after he had eaten or drunk.* De Conſecr. diſt. 1. c. ut illud.

Zepherinus *decreed, That the greater cauſes of the Church are to be determined by the Apoſtolick See, becauſe the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors had ordained.* Ep. to the Biſhop of *Sicily.* 217.

Theſe were all Popes of *Rome*, but no true Proteſtants I hope.

W. T. We reject all theſe ſpecious Evidences as diſingenuous Forgeries. *Una litura ſat eſt.*

The Grounds of our Rejection are theſe.

1. Becauſe the Style is not varied (whereas commonly Mens Expreſſions are as different as their Complexions, their Styles as their Features.)

As the Style is not varied, ſo it is not adorned, not only void of the Elegancy of Rhetorick, but of the congruity of the Grammar, directly repugnant to the terſeneſs, the politeneſs of the Phraſe of thoſe times, both for Eccleſiaſtical and prophane Authors (*Minuius*, *Felix*, St. *Cyprian*, *Pliny*, *Suetonius*,) the uniform barbariſm of Expreſſion manifeſts theſe decretals to be the products of the ſame rude Pen in a later corrupter Age than is pretended.

2. Becauſe the Matter of theſe Decretals doth not correſpond with the Piety and Exigency of thoſe times of bloody Perſecution. They conduce to promote Ambition,

bition, not Martyrdom, to gratifie Carnal, not Spiritual Intereſts, calculated for the ſplendour of the Church, not its Umbrage, its Adverſity, not to excite Devotion, but ſupport Preheminence, ὑπερέχειν ἐμμανὲς ἄλλων.

3. The Scripture Citations are according to St. *Jerom*'s Tranſlation, whereas the youngeſt Pope in the preſent Catalogue (in diſpute) were deceaſed many years before St. *Jerom*'s Birth, in the year 341.

I might add to this falſeh[illegible] point of Chronology, the inadvertency of a fallacy [illegible] dating ſeveral Decretal Epiſtles by the account of ſuch Conſuls who never were joyned together according to the Teſt. of *Baronius Annals*, and ſome in other Ages ſeparated.

Alex. Ep. prima, ſecunda.
Sexti Ep. prima, ſecunda.
Teleſph. Epiſt.
Pii Ep. prima, ſecunda.
Soteris Ep. ſecunda.
Victoris Ep. prima.
Fabiani Epiſt.
Cornelii Ep. ſecunda.
Lucii Epiſt.
Sixti ſecundi Epiſt. Cum multis aliis.

4. Theſe Decrees are not mentioned by *Euſebius*, the Favourite of *Conſtantine* the Great in the Eaſt, nor by St. *Jerome* who converſt with Pope *Damaſus* in the Weſt, not by *Damaſus* himſelf, though ſuch had fair occaſions of relating them, had there been any ſuch, they are not recorded, not inſiſted, not reflected on by any of the Fathers for 800 years after Chriſt.

They were firſt brought upon the Stage by *Iſidore* a Collector of Councils and (pretended) Decretal Epiſtles in the beginning of the Ninth *Century* inſerted in the *Roman* Code, firſt countenanced by Pope *Leo* the Fourth on the midſt of that Century preſcribed as Authentick to the *Britiſh* Biſhops, and afterwards within Ten years by his next but one immediately Succeſſor, Pope *Nicholas* the Eighteenth, Authoritatively recommended to the *Gallicane* Biſhops. The Papal uſurpt Juriſdiction in that Age wanted ſuch adulterate ſtamps to paſs for currant *Coyne*. Not one of theſe Decretal Epiſtles was received, recited in the *Univerſal Code*, the Primitive Venerable Rule conſiſting of the Canons of the Councils; Four whereof were General as to the Convention; the reſt were General in point of Eſtimate, and Approbation. That *Iſidore* from whom theſe Decretal Epiſtles take their Riſe, their Original for Extraction, was not *Iſidore Peluſiot*, moſt illuſtrious for Piety and Antiquity; not

not *Iſidore Hiſpalenſis* the Noted Famous Biſhop of *Siville* in *Spain*, Scholar to St. *Gregory*: But a later notorious, infamous *Iſidore* Mercator, who made Religion his Merchandize, Antiquity his diſguiſe (to act the *Gibeonites*) who vented Novel Impoſtures for Ancient Decrees. This is not the Impeachment only of Proteſtants; *Baronius* aſcribes to him ſome of the Decretal Epiſtles.

Turrianus a haſty Zeal[illegible] of the School of *Ignatius* aſſay'd to vindicate (ineffe[illegible]) the integrity of the Decretal Epiſtles.

Others of the ſame Society, but of a higher Rank, of more piercing judgments, *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, *Cuſanus*, would not adventure to be Advocates for ſuch egregious frauds.

As for *Bellarmine*, I ſhall not inſiſt upon his acknowledgment of this ſpurious Off ſpring, though atteſted by ſome credible Witneſſes, becauſe not apparent in the printed Edition of his Lectures at *Rome*.

Aliquos errores in has Epiſtolas irrepſiſſe non negaverim, nec indubitatus eſſe affirmare audeam. Bell. de Re Pont. l. 2. c. 14.

I ſtill find extant in the Edition of *Sartorius* at *Ingolſt*, that ſome Errors are crept into theſe Epiſtles; neither dare I aſſert them to be undoubted.

Baronius did leſs mince, who profeſt that he demonſtrated, that in many reſpects they are ſuſpected.

Cuſanus is yet more clear and poſitive in his Confeſſion, That they betray themſelves.

Ex multis ſuſpectas eas reddi Epiſtolas alibi demonſtratum. Baron. An. 865. To. 10. Nu 67.

Thus have I declared the invalidity of the forgery of the pretended Ancient Decretal Epiſtles in general.

As for thoſe diſtinctly cited by *H. T.* for the Third Century.

Stipſas produnt. Cuſ. de. Conc Cath. l. 3. c 2.

Beſides the exceptions common to others, they moſt of them are of points Ritual, not Doctrinal, touching the Shadow, the Ceremony, not the Body the Subſtance of Religion.

As they are Subjects of little Importance, ſo of leſs difference betwixt the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, and therefore are ſtrangely alledged for the Conviction or Confuration of any intelligent Adverſaries.

There

These are but three Decrees of Popes produced in this Century of any material controversal moment.

The one is a determination in point of Fact, the other in point of Right and Prerogative.

The matter of Fact is the Testimony of *Anicetus*, that *James* was made Bishop of *Jerusalem* by *Peter*, *James* and *John*. Whereas more solemn credible Records of Antiquity without Corruption, testifie that *James* among all the Apostles, first obtained the Episcopal Throne, and that from Christ himself.

Euseb. Hist. l. 2. c. 1. πρῶτος ἔλαχε τὴν καθέδραν τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς ἐπὶ πᾶσιν κύριος ἰησοῦς Epiph. in Antidicomarianitis.

If this be a true Narrative of *Anicetus*, why does *Bellarmine*, *Jo. de Turrecremata* and others the Learnedst Sticklers for the Church of *Rome* not adhere to it? Who derive the Episcopal preheminence of St. *James* at *Jerusalem* entirely from St. *Peter*. Were this a true Genuine Epistle of *Anicetus*, were this an Authentick Evidence, yet this would but sort and rank *Peter* with *James* and *John*, which will not cotten with the Papal singular Exaltment. To palliate, to cloak rather than to vindicate the Testimony of *Anicetus*. *Anacletus* is cited (*Ep.* 2. *dist.* 25.) *dignum patellæ operculum*, one Imposture brought for Security for another. That this Epistle of *Anacletus* is suppositicious among many Arguments, I shall select two. In point of Chronology *Clemens* is mentioned in this Epistle as Predecessor to *Anacletus*, whereas if *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Eusebius*, *Epiphanius*, and others of the Primitive Worthies of the Church may be credited, *Clemens* was his Successor. I shall not need to insist upon Modern Evidences for this Rank, since it is acknowledged by *Bellarmine*.

Bellarm. de Pont. Rom. l. 1. c. 23. Turrecrem. de l. 2. Gum. Eccl. c. 32.

Irenæus. l 3. c. 3. Tertul. l. 3. comm. adversus Manic. Euseb. l. 3. Hist. Eccl. c. 54. Epiphan. Hæres. 27. Bellarm. l. 4. de Not. Eccles. c. 8.

2. In point of Theology. That Epistle relates that the Seventy Disciples were Elected by the Apostles, whereas *Anacletus* was a better Divine, a better Textuary than to be ignorant of the Record of St. *Luke* 10. 1. that the Lord appointed those Disciples. They had their Mission, their Commission from him.

The

The two other Decretal Epiſtles of material difference, of *Anacletus* and *Zepherinus* alledged of the ſame importance, are of the ſame, (of no) credit, concerning the Deciſion of grand, of difficult Cauſes by the Apoſtolick See.

Neither is Extant in the entire Univerſal Code forementioned, approved, ratified by the Great General Council of *Chalcedon*, (even in the firſt Canon of it) in the year 451, nor in the Tranſlation of it out of *Greek* to *Latin*, by *Dionyſius Exiguus* a *Roman* Abbot (devoted to the *Roman* Intereſt) in the year 325, nor yet in the Breviaion of *Ferrandus* (as he titles it) in the year 530.

There could be no ſuch Decree *de jure*, in point of Right, there was no ſuch *de facto* in point of Fact. Not of Right, becauſe it had been lyable to two Brands in the School Divinity, an Uſurpt Judgment not warranted by due Authority, extended beyond the bounds of the *Roman* Patriarchal Sphere, the utmoſt pale of its Juriſdiction in the Primitive Church.

Leges ſemper ad æquitatem flectendæ ſunt. Cicero.

It had been alſo deſtitute of Equity, the byaſs of Laws to which they are to be bended, ſaith *Cicero.*) It had been an unſupportable moleſtation of Expence and Travel which the Primitive Church did prudentially prevent in ſeveral Councils, even in the firſt General Council of *Nice.*

Concil. Nicen. Can. 5. Concil. Antioch. Can. 6. & 15. Concil. Milevit. c. 22.

That there was no ſuch Decree in point of Fact, is more than probably evinced by the Hiſtorical Tranſactions in the pureſt Antiquity.

In the Ancient Conteſts in point of Appeal betwixt the *Roman* and *African* Churches, no ſuch Decree was produced, pretended, which had not been waved, had there been any teſtimony to have been tendred. St. *John* the Evangeliſt being at *Epheſus*, did not ſuſpend the doom of the *Nicolaitans*, or *Cerinthians*, in expectation of the Dictate or Sentence of the See of *Rome.*

St.

St. *Polycarpus* Biſhop of *Smyrna*, the Diſciple of St. *John* in the Teſtimony of St. *Jerome*, contended with *Anicetus* Biſhop of *Rome*, touching the obſervation of *Eaſter*, and would not ſubmit to his Judgment. Both reſolutely perſiſted in their different Opinions, without preſcription to, or condemnation of each other. Hieron. in Catal. Script. Eccleſiaſt. Niceph. l. 4. c. 39.

Such was the true Candour of that *Anicetus*, falſly produced in point of Dominion, or Domination rather of the *Roman* Prelacy.

Which being violently purſued by Pope *Victor* (in the track of the ſame Controverſie) his Sanction was rejected though abetted by a *Roman* Synod, his Excommunication diſregarded by *Polycrates* and other *Aſiatick* Biſhops.

St. *Irenæus* Biſhop of *Lyons* in *France*, the Scholar of St. *Polycarp*, though he owned the Tenour of Pope *Victor*, yet in his own and the concurrent Judgment of the *Gallicane* Divines, he reprehended *Victor* with a Holy Acrimony.

When ſeveral points were warmly Controverted in the *Africane* Church, within the Compaſs of the Third Century (the preſent conſideration) St. *Cyprian*, the Martyr, Biſhop of *Carthage* did not wait for a deciſion from *Rome*, but did refer the Queſtions to be diſcuſt and determined by *Africane* Councils.

When St. *Cornelius* (his Contemporary) Biſhop of *Rome* did intermeddle in the Eccleſiaſtical Affairs of his Province (of *Carthage*) St. *Cyprian* did hotly Reſent and Expoſtulate the Encroachment. Cyp. Ep. 55.

In his Epiſtle he terms the Biſhop of *Rome*, a Colleague, a Brother. I deny not but the See of *Rome* was in the pureſt Antiquity conſulted with from other Churches, but it was Arbitrary of Choice, not neceſſary of Duty; it was prompted by a veneration had not to the power, the Authority of the *Roman* See, but to the Piety and Literature of the *Roman* Prelates (for the firſt Three Centuries moſt of them died Martyrs.) Cypr. Ep. 1, 2-67.

Episcopi quoq; Romanæ Ecclesiæ meam adhuc expectant sententiam quid existimem scribere de die Paschæ Amb. Ep. 73.

Upon this account the Patriarks and Bishops of other Churches were frequently consulted with, out of the verge of their own Jurisdictions. From the See of *Rome*, the Judgment of St. *Ambrose* was implored from *Millaine*.

Cyprian. Ep. 55.

Sometimes Convicted, Condemned Delinquents in other Churches repaired to the See of *Rome*, as Fugitives to skulk, as Sophisters to delude. Such were *Fortunatus* and *Felicissimus* doomed in *Africa*.

Cyprian. Ep. 68.

Thus when *Basilides* was justly Excommunicated, Deposed in *Spain*, he fled to *Rome*, and fraudulently wrought upon the facility of Pope *Stephen* (not reputed Infallible, this being not the Divinity of that Age) to bustle in the behalf of himself and *Martialis* (alike Criminal, and alike Sentenced) for their re-admission. This precipitate, unjustifiable attempt gave great offence to the *Spanish* Bishops, who passionately complained of it to St. *Cyprian* and the other Bishops of *Carthage*, requesting their Advice, who unanimously animated them to persist in their Sentence of Excommunication, not to submit to *Stephanus*, not to re-admit such Malefactors.

Nec rescindere ordinationem jure perfectam potest. Cypr. Epist. eadem.

Sabinus being rightly the Successor of *Basilides* ejected, St. *Cyprian* confidently determin, That it could not be rescinded by Pope *Stephen*.

Sozom. l. 3. c. 7. Sozom. l. 6. c. 19. Nazianz. *in* Orat. de laude Her.

Sometimes Innocent persecuted Persons in other Churches, made their applications to the See of *Rome* But it was as to a Sanctuary for refuge, not as to a Tribunal for Judicature, an address to the Pope, not an Appeal.

This was the case of St. *Athanasius*, his Successor St. *Peter*, of St. *Chrysostome*, St. *Flavianus*, and others; it was a resort as to an Orthodox Prelate (because of the Communion of the same Faith) not as to a Supreme Judge (upon a Prerogative of Power), it was for advice, for solace; not in expectation of a final Sentence, of an irrevocable Decree.

Æneas

Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pope *Pius* the Second had ſo much Ingenuity, as to acknowledge that before the *Nicene Council*, every Biſhop lived to himſelf; and that there was ſmall regard had to the Church of *Rome*.

Ante Nicenam Synodum quiſq; ſibi vixit, at parvus reſpectus ad Romanam Eccleſiam habebatur. Æn. Sylv. Ep. 288.

Even after the *Nicene Council*, the Primitive Biſhops of *Rome* for a time would not aſſume to themſelves: Would not uſurp that Power of deciding important difficulties beyond the limits of their own Patriarchal Juriſdiction.

I ſhall cull out two Inſtances in the Cauſes of two Learned, Renowned, but Perſecuted Patriarks (the one of *Alexandria*, the other of *Conſtantinople*) of St. *Athanaſius* and St. *Chryſoſtome*.

In the former, *Conſtantius* the *Arrian* Emperour being exaſperated againſt St. *Athanaſius*, *Liberius* Biſhop of *Rome* cajoled him, ſupplicated him, that a Council might be aſſembled at *Alexandria*, he offered in effect the ſame reaſon for appointing *Alexandria* in the Cauſe of St. *Athanaſius*, that St *Cyprian* did in excepting againſt *Rome* in the *African* concerns. (Where the Party impeacht, the Accuſers, Advocates, and others intereſted, may moſt fitly be convened.) This is recited in the admirable Colloquy (as the Centuriſt of *Magdeburg* ſtile it) betwixt *Conſtantius* and *Liberius*.

Cypr. Ep. 55. Theodor. Hiſt. l. 2. c. 16.

Magdeb. in Cent. 4. cap. 3.

Liberius alledged no deciſive Juriſdiction in himſelf, in the See of *Rome*.

The later inſtance is the cauſe of St. *Chryſoſtome*, wherein Pope *Innocentius* the firſt declared a neceſſity of a *Synodal* Convention to aſſwage the Tempeſt in the Church.

Sozom. l. 8. cap. 26.

He aſſerted no Papal Oecumenical Power to determine Controverſies.

He approved the *Milevitan* Council, which prohibited Appeals in the *African* Churches, unleſs to *African* Councils or Primates, Excommunicates Appellants to tranſmarine Juriſdictions.

Innocent. in Ep. ad Milevit. Concil. *Non provocent niſi ad* Africana Concilia, *vel ad Primates provinciarum ſuarum: Ad tranſmarina autem qui putaverint appellandum, à nullo intra* Africam *in communionem ſuſcipiantur.* Concil. Milevit.

About Sixteen years after the Sixth *Carthaginian* Council which laſted ſix years, having regularly chalked out the gradations of Appeals in the *African* Church, abſolutely debarred any to the See of *Rome*. I have dilated this point, becauſe the *Roman* Champions lay ſo much ſtreſs upon it, and that I may not need to ventilate, to ſift it any more in this Tract.

I have not yet examined the Proofs in the ſuppoſititious Decretal Epiſtles of *Anacletus* and *Zepherinus*. The latter derives the Power of the Apoſtolick See from the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors. The former from the Apoſtles by the Commandment of our Lord. Fallacies are enwrapped, ſhrowded in generalities. No injunction of Chriſt or any of his Apoſtles is recited for the Papal final deciding of difficult Controverſies.

De non exiſtentibus & de non apparentibus eadem eſt ratio. What is not apparent, may rationally be rejected as not exiſtent.

After theſe falſe varniſhes of Antiquity, *H. T.* having marſhalled the ſpecious Pictures of a Gallery, rather than the vigorous Forces of a Camp, or the Arguments of the School, he inſults before he vanquiſhes, or indeed encounters, marches in Triumph like the *Roman* Emperour with his Army, having collected *Cockleſhels*, not conquered any Enemies. He quits the Field in this quarrel with a flaunting Trophee of Victory. Theſe were all Popes of *Rome*, but no true Proteſtants I hope. This Sarcaſme is more imbitter'd with Gall, than ſeaſoned with Salt.

Hiſt of the Counc. *of* Trent, *by* Piet. Soave Polano. p. 48. l. 1.

The Name of Proteſtants took its Riſe in the year 1529, from the proteſtation of Six Princes and 14 Principal Cities of *Germany*, an appeal from the Decree of the *Diet* to *Cæſar*, and to a future General Council, or National of *Germany*, and to all Judges not ſuſpected.

Theſe

Theſe Proteſtants did, and thoſe who are ſo called, do ſtill own the Tenets in Religion of the Popes recited in this Third Century.

H. T. *Catholick Profeſſors to the year* 300.

Simplicius, Callepodius, Abdon, Sennen, Pammachius, Tyburtius, Valerianus, Marcellinus, Dorotheus, Gordianus Pudentiana, Triphon, Elæſius, Maximianus Clemens, Barbara, Agatha, Apollonia, Cyprianus, Hippolytus, Gregorius Thaumauturgus, Laurentius Tharſus, Cecilia, Victorius, Nemeſius, Olympius, Adrianus, Georgius, Pantaleon, Agens, Barlain, Jereon, *with his Companions*, Coſmas, Damianus, Mauritius, *with the* Theban *Legion*, &c.

W. T. This Muſter of Names is no Hoſtile Battalia, unleſs againſt your ſelves.

We aſſert a real affinity Doctrinal and Practical with theſe Saints and Martyrs, whereas you degenerate from the Purity, the Loyalty of their Principles.

The *Theban* Legion that brings up the Rear, was not trained up in the Corrupt, Modern *Romiſh* Divinity, ſtating it lawful to reſiſt Princes in caſe of Infidelity, Hereſie, or Tyranny, which *Bellarmine* did not bluſh to aver to be the common ſentiment of Divines.

H. T. *Catholick Profeſſors to the year* 400.

Domnus *with* 2000 *Martyrs*, Lucianus Theodorus, Paulus *the firſt Eremite*, Jacobus Niſſibitanus, Spiridion, Macharius, Nicolaus, Helena (*the Mother of* Conſtantine *the Great*) Conſtantine (*the firſt Chriſtian Emperour*) Marcus, Arethuſius, Nicetus, Theodorus, Antonius, Hilarion, Athanaſius, Paulus Conſtantinopolitanus, Hilarius, Martianus, Baſilius, Hieronimus, Epiphanius, Patianus, Ambroſe, Cyril *of* Jeruſalem, &c.

Nations

Nations converted. Dacians, Gebes, Beſſites, Scythians, Morines, Armenians, Hunnes, Indians, Æthiopians, &c.

W. T. This is to bandy with, and to rout your own ſhadow. We moſt willingly refer our differences (next to the Sacred Scripture) to the Teſt of theſe and the precedent Primitive Worthies of the Church.

H. T. *From the year of Chriſt* 300.

Chief Paſtors.	General Councils.
304 Marcellus 309 Euſebius 312 Melchiades 314 Sylveſter 336 Malchus 339 Julius 352 Liberius 358 Fœlix 2. 367 Damaſus 385 Siricius 398 Anaſtaſius	The firſt *Nicene Council* (Fathers 328) approved by Pope *Sylveſter*, *An. Dom.* 325. againſt *Arrius*. Authors, *Cedrenus*, *Photius*, *Socrates*, *Euſebius*. The Firſt *Conſtantinopolitane Council* (Fathers 150) Pope *Damaſus* preſiding, *An. Dom.* 381. againſt *Macedonius*. Authors, *Socrates*, *Photius*, *Baronius*.

W. T. Theſe Authorities are Impertinencies as to the preſent diſpute. We reject not any Teſtimonies of the venerable Popes nominated, that are not ſpurious: If any of thoſe be not ours, 'tis becauſe they are not their own. They may be eſpouſed by ſuch by whom they are corrupted.

Male dum recitas incipit eſſe tuus.

We adhere to the firſt *Nicene* Council, and the firſt *Conſtantinopolitan* cited, we explode the Hereſie of *Arrius* condemned in the one, and of *Macedonius* in the other.

That

That the *Nicene* Council was approved by Pope *Sylveſter* was not ſingular, it was allowed, ſubſcribed by all the other Biſhops. It was *Sylveſters* Suffrage, his Conſent, not his Edict, his Bull to ratifie it, if *Sylveſter* were then Living. That it was in the time of his Succeſſor, Pope *Julius*, Dr. *Whitaker*, proves by the Teſtimonies of *Sozomen*, *l.* 1. *c.* 17. *Athanaſ. Apol.* 2. *Nicephor. l.* 7. *c.* 14. *Beda in Chron.*

However that Council was convened, governed, confirmed, it was by the Authority of *Conſtantine* the Great. Ruffinus, l. 1. c. 17. Sozom. l. 1. c. 11. Theod. l. 3. c. 7.

It is alledged by *H. T.* That Pope *Damaſus* preſided in the Firſt *Conſtantinopolitane* Council. Socr. l. 1. c. 6.

Whereas *Damaſus* was ſo far from being Preſident of, that he was not preſent in that Council, not perſonally, nor repreſentatively by a Proxy, by any Legate, but *Nectarius*, Arch-Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, of Noble Extraction preſided.

Bellarmines plea is κρησφύγιον, a ſubterfuge to evade, not a proof to demonſtrate. That if *Damaſus* had not been abſent, he had preſided.

An Inference of no validity. *Vigilius* Biſhop of *Rome* ſat in the Fifth Oecumenical, but did not preſide in it. This Dignity was not fixt, entail'd to the Papacy of *Rome*.

The Popes were Preſidents in ſome Ancient Councils, but not in all, Not in the firſt *Nicene*, not in the firſt or ſecond *Conſtantinopolitane*, not in the firſt or ſecond *Epheſine*, not in the *Sardique*, not in the *Carthaginian* Council.

Had *Damaſus* been Preſident in the Firſt *Conſtantinopolitane* Council. yet they would not have vindicated the tranſcendent Papal Prerogative in and over Councils, (challenged in later times) not attempted, aſpired to in the Primitive Church.)

Since

Ἀφ ὃ χριστιανίζειν ἤρξαντο, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πράγματα ἠρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν, καὶ αἱ μεγίσται Συνοδοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ γεγονασι καὶ γίνονται Socrat. in Pr. l. 5. Hist. Eccl.

Since Soveraigns began to be Christians, Ecclesiastical Affairs depended upon them; The greatest Synods have been and are convened by them.

This is solemnly attested by *Socrates* about the midst of the Fifth Century.

The Instanced first *Constantinopolitane* Council was summon'd, establisht, dismist by *Theodosius* the Emperour, the Senior.

H. T. *From the Year* 400.

402 Innocentius I.	*The First* Ephesine *Council* (*Fathers* 200) *Pope* Celestine *presiding*, Anno Dom. 431. *against* Nestor.
417 Sozimus	
419 Bonifacius I.	
424 Calixtus I.	
432 Sixtus III.	*Authors* Nicephorus, Baronius.
440 Leo Magnus	
461 Hilarius	*The* Chalcedon *Council*, (*Fathers* 600) *Pope* Leo *presiding*, Anno Dom. 451. *against* Eutyches.
468 Simplicius	
483 Felix	
492 Gelasius I.	
497 Anastasius	*Authors* Leo Ep. 50. Baronius, &c.
499 Symmachus	

W. T. I shall not contend, touching the formal Musters of your Popes in point of Divinity or Chronology.

Pope *Celestines* presiding in the first *Ephesine* Council, is easier asserted than proved *Celestine* was at that time personally engaged in an *Italian* Council (which was not esteemed Oecumenical, but its Contemporary, the *Ephesine* consisting of the Eastern Bishops.)

The *Romish* Champions plead that Pope *Celestine* did constitute St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* to be his Proxy.

If I grant, he did delegate his suffrage (there being a singular Correspondence betwixt these two Orthodox Prelates) yet not a Prerogative of presiding in the Council, which though arbitrarily, sometimes indulged

to

to the Pope in perſon, yet was not ſo neceſſarily annext to the Papal Dignity, as to be challenged by his Legates (as not in the Fifth *Carthag. Conc.*)

It is teſtified by *Sozomen*, that *Vius* and *Vincentius* the Popes Legates in the Council of *Nice* ſate in the Fourth place. Sozom. l. 1. c. 17.

St. *Cyril* Patriarch of *Alexandria* had been active in confuting *Neſtorius*, in exciting the Emperour to ſummon the Council. He was the moſt Eminent Prelate preſent, the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, being in umbrage under the Eclipſe of a charge of Hereſie, ſo that it is moſt probable that he did preſide not as ſubſtitute from *Rome*, but as Patriarch of *Alexandria*; even before any Declaration Pope *Leo* recites him as Preſident of the firſt *Epheſine* Council, without the leaſt mention of any derivation or luſtre from his Predeceſſor, Pope *Celeſtine*. Evagrius l. 1. c. 3. Niceph. l. 14. c. 34. *Prioris* Epheſinæ *Synodi cui ſanctæ memoriæ* Cyrillus *Epiſcopus præſedit.* Leo in Epiſt. 47.

This is expreſly, ſolemnly atteſted in the Code, who ever was in the Nature of Moderator, he was inferior to the Emperour in the tranſactions of that Council to *Theodoſius*, who not only ſummoned, eſtabliſht, authoriſed it, but had a ſingular over-ruling influence in regulating it, in compoſing differences in it. The Fathers convened in that Synod ſolemnly implored the Emperors Ratification. Epheſina *Synodus cui beatæ memoriæ* Cyrillus *præſuit.* Cod. l. 1. Tit. 8. Cap. 8.

True it is, the firſt *Epheſine* Council in an Epiſtle to Pope *Celeſtine*, gave him an account of their Proceedings againſt *Neſtorius*, but it was out of Amity, not Duty; a Conformity in point of Faith, not a Submiſſion in point of Power. The Epiſtle is directed in a ſtyle of parity. *Rogamus* Clementiam *tuam ut per literas tuæ pietatis ratum eſſe jubeas, confirmes ad Populi documentum.* In Epiſt. Orthodox.

As touching the Council of *Chalcedon*. If I grant the Popes Legates had a precedence by the favour of the *Sanctiſſimo Piiſſimoq; comministro* Celeſtino Act. Conc. Epheſ. Tom. 4. cap. 17.

ſancta Synodus quæ per Dei gratiam Epheſi *convenit à Domino ſalutem* D.

Prince, or the respect of the Fathers convened to the personal Eminence, or Patriarchal Lustre of *Leo* the First.

Yet the Emperour *Martianus* did seem to preside, as the grand Moderator in that Council, at first personally immediately, afterwards mediately by his Commissioners, who are solemnly recited before the Fathers assembled.

Evagrius l. 2. c. 4.

However the Authoritative influence for the Convention, Ratification of that Oecumenical Synod is clearly ascribed to the Emperour.

Act. 1. Synod. Chalc.

How solemn is the submission to the Emperours pleasure. He prohibited all disputations against the Doctrine of the Council of *Nice*, by his Authority *Dioscorus* was Condemned, and *Proterius* Establisht in his place.

Ἐι παραςαίω τῷ θειωτατῳ ἡμῶν δεσπότῃ Evag. 16.

The Legates of the Bishop of *Rome* in that Synod intreated the Moderators of the Council, that *Dioscorus* should be required to recede, which themselves had enjoyned, not requested had they presided.

Act. 1. Synod. Chalc.

Act. ult. Synod. Chalc.

Act. 1. Synod. Chalc.

In the Sixteenth Article of that Synod, the Decree was opposite to the Sentiments of the Popes Legates.

In that Article *Anatolius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople* first subscribed, whom Pope *Gelasius* recited, as the chiefest Author of the Twenty seven Canons set out in that Synod, *Anno Domini* 500.

27 *Canones editos esse quorum Authores ut maximè* Anatholius *Episcopus* Constantinopol. Dist. 16. c. Sancta Octo.

H. T. *The first* Nicene *Council defined against* Arrius, *That the Son of God is consubstantial to his Father and true God.*

W. T. This Testimony is impertinently produced. The Church of *England* doth detest *Arrianisme* as much as the Church of *Rome*.

H. T. 2. *That he who holds the See of* Rome, *is the Head and Chief of all the Patriarks, seeing he is the first; as* Peter, *to whom Power Ecclesiastical is given over all*

Christian

Christian Princes, and all People, &c. *and whosoever shall contradict this, is Excommunicated by the Synod.* Can. 39. Arab.

W. T. We own a great veneration for the Great, the first General Council, the first *Nicene*. From which track St. *Ambrose* would not recede for the peril of Death, nor for the terror of the Sword.

Siquor Tractatum Concilii Niceni, à quo me nec mors, nec gladius potest separare Amb. l. 1. de Trinit.

Which St. *Basil* propounded for the Test, whereby judgment is to be made of Hereticks.

Basil. Ep. 28.

As with St. *Athanasius*, we wonder at their audaciousness, who start any question in points that have past the determination of that *Nicene* Council; so we cannot without astonishment resent the disingenuous fraud in counterfeiting so Venerable a Record in obtruding a Fable for an Oracle.

Athan. in Ep. ad Spir.

The more famous the Authority is of the *Nicene* Council, the more infamous is the Impiety in falsifying it.

The alledged Thirty Ninth *Arabick* Canon may be unmaskt, and then appear a *Romish* Imposture.

That there were but Twenty Genuine Canons of the *Nicene* Council, is proved by the Authority of *Rufinus*, *Isidore*, *Theodoret*, (Testimonies acknowledged by *Baronius*) by Pope *Stephen*, (attested by *Gratian*) by Two Hundred and Seventeen Bishops Convened in the Sixth Council of *Carthage*, by unanimous suffrages of uncorrupt Antiquity.

The *Nicene* Synod was held the Year 316, the tumor the amplifying of the Canons to the number of Thirty in the Notion and Style of *Arabick* Canons, produced above Twelve Hundred years after.

When they first appeared to the World, they were pretended to be brought by *Baptista Romanus* from the Patriark of *Alexandria*, set out by *Alphonsus*, *Pizanus*, and *Franciscus Turrianus*, both of the same Society, both zealous Advocates not only for asserting, but straining

the Papal Preheminence (*per faſq; nefaſq;*) Firſt inſerted in the Editſon of the Councils at *Venice* by *Dominicus. Nicolinus* in the Year 1585. not above Five years before printed apart (the *Plantine* Impreſſion) by *Turrianus.*

It appears at the firſt bluſh as ſtrange an incongruity in Geography as Chronology at ſo great a diſtance of time and place, to vindicate the Canons of the *Nicene* Council in the Fourth Century, by an *Arabick* remote Evidence in the Sixteenth Century.

How have they been obſcured dormant for ſo many Ages?

Tota res ad conjecturas & ſigna quibus veritas illuſtrari ſolet traducenda eſt.

Turrianus the moſt confident Stickler for theſe *Arabick* Canons acknowledged there is no Record as to any Tranſlation of theſe out of *Greek* to *Arabick*, no proof, no evidence but conjecture.

The wily Jeſuit pretending to wave infinite other Teſtimonies (in the ſmooth Rhetorick, the ſubtle fallacy of his Mention by way of Omiſſion) inſiſts on the *Africane* Fathers as ſufficient Witneſſes, alledging, unleſs they had certainly and exactly known this, they would not ſo have written to Pope *Boniface*. Becauſe they could find Canons in no *Greek* Books, they earneſtly deſire they might be ſent to them out of the Churches of the *Eaſt*, by the endeavours of Pope *Boniface*. They ſpeak of the reſt of the Canons, for Twenty they had ſent by *Cyrill* of *Alexandria*, and *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople*, and recited in the Sixth Council of *Carthage*.

I am amazed that there ſhould be ſo little integrity in a Perſon of ſo much Literature as *Turrianus* of the profeſt Society of the *Holy Jeſus* (the Name of a Saint being the Guilt, the Impeachment of a Miſcreant according to *Salvian*) ſo notoriouſly to juggle and prevaricate.

Nomen Sancti reatus impii. Salvian.

For the clearer diſcovery of his Colluſion, and the more warrantable rejection of the additional *Arabick* Canons, I ſhall offer a true ſummary Narrative of the tranſactions of the *Africane* Fathers falſly preſented by *Turrianus.*

Apiarius

Apiarius being juſtly deliberately ſentenced in *Africa* (Synodically Excommunicated) was unjuſtly, unconſiderately Countenanced, Acquitted at *Rome*, (one Party only being heard.) To promote his Reſtitution in the Sixth *Carthage* Council, Pope *Zozymus* ſent thither Three Legates, who preſt a Canon of the *Nicene* Council to juſtifie Appeals to *Rome*. The *African* Fathers were ſtartled at a Novel Claim abetted by an unheard of Canon, wherein they firſt examined the Copy brought from *Nice* by *Concilianus* (Arch-Biſhop of *Carthage*) in which they found no ſuch Canon alledged. However they were not prone to ſuſpect any fraud in the Biſhop of *Rome*, (where there is the greateſt Truth, there being alſo the greateſt Charity) but proceeded with an equal mixture of Prudence and Candour.

Qui judicat inauditâ alterâ parte, licet æquum ſuerit judicium, haud æquus fuerit judex. Sen.

They reſolved to tranſmit *Mercuries* to *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, to procure Genuine Tranſcripts of the *Nicene* Canons, and whilſt the matter was in ſuſpence, they condeſcended to admit Appeals to *Rome*.

They imparted their deſign to the Legates, implored their joint Aſſiſtance, made ſeveral Addreſſes in this ſincere purſuit of Truth to Three Popes in their Succeſſions (*Zozymus*, *Bonifacius*, *Celeſtine*.)

After the concurrent Teſtimonies, the Exact Copies ſent from the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* and *Alexandria*, after the diſcuſſion of 6 Years, there being no contrary Evidence produced by either of the Popes recited, or their Legates; the *African* Biſhops unanimouſly rejected the obtruded Canons as ſpurious, and prohibited all Appeals from the *African* Churches to *Rome*.

There never was a more calm, accurate, mature ventilation of any Claim. Never clearer Evidence. Twenty Canons only found in the *Archives* of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*; *Antioch*, being ſearcht with great diligence, as *Baronius* confeſſes.

Atticus

Attious profeſt in his Reſcript that Copy to be unmaimed, ἐν ὁλοκλήρῳ.

St. *Cyrill* as confidently avouches the fidelity of his alſo, ἀληθέστατα ἔσα.

Never a more manifeſt Conviction of a Notorious Fraud, whereto the *Roman* Legates being moſt probably too conſcious, would not cloſe with the *African* Fathers in an unbyaſt, untainted Scrutiny; but reiterated their importunate Motion, that the Examination and Deciſion might be referred entirely to the Biſhop of *Rome*, that the Criminal Party might be the ſole Judge.

To palliate the Deformity of this Impoſture, other Adulterate Teſtimonies are vaunted of the Letter of *Athanaſius* to Pope *Marcus*, and the Reſcript of *Marcus* which are not only by the Centuriſts and other Reformed Divines proved to be fraudulent upon ſifting the Phraſe, and the Subject, Calculating the Date; but the more Learned *Romiſh* Champions *Poſſerine*, *Bellarmine*, *Baronius* have confeſt it.

The laſt whereof (that famous *Analiſt*) Records the deceaſe of Pope *Marcus* before the date of his pretended Letter, and brands it together with a counterfeit ſubmiſſion of [redacted] a ſucceeding Biſhop of *Carthage*; to be fictions of the ſame Forge. I have dilated this detection, the rather becauſe the *Romaniſts* lay ſo much ſtreſs upon ſo weak, ſo falſe a foundation.

H. T. *Thereby a Man is freed from the ſervitude and corruption of Sin.* l. 3. Decret.

4. *That the Lamb of God which takes away the Sins of the World is placed on the Sacred Table* (*the Altar*) *to be ſacrificed unbloodily, and that we receiving his Body and Blood, do believe theſe things to be ſigns of our Reſurrection.* l. 3. Decret. De Divinâ Menſâ.

It Decreed, That a Biſhop dying, Notice ſhall be given of his Death to all Churches and Monaſteries in the Pariſh, that Prayer be made for him, C. 65. Arab. *And that Deacons*

Deacons (who have no Power to offer Sacrifice) ought not to give the Body and Blood of Christ to Priests who have full power. Can. 14.

W. T. Neither the *Papal* Decrees, nor the *Arabick* Canons of the *Nicene* Council are to be allowed for Orthodox Tests in deciding Controversies. I shall not reiterate my Exceptions against the Fallacy of both.

As for the Restraint of Deacons in reference to Priests recited, it is a point of Discipline, not Doctrine; a Regularity not to be contended for, if rightly understood.

H. T. *The First* Constantinopolitane *Council defined against* Macedonius, *who denyed the Holy Ghost to be God, and decreed the Bishop of* Constantinople *to be chief next to the Bishop of* Rome.

W. T. This Allegation consists of two branches: The First is Impertinent, the Second Fraudulent.

The Church of *England* explodes the *Macedonian* Heresie as much as the Church of *Rome*, as is evident in the Fifth Article of the Church of *England*.

As to the second branch of the Allegation, it is offered with little Fidelity, or at least Advertency.

The Patriarch of *Constantinople* was not mentioned in the *Nicene* Council, wherein the priviledge of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch* are solemnly recited, *Constantinople* being then in Eclipse, in Umbrage, in respect of its succeeding Splendor. After it was augmented, adorned, dignified by the Translation of the Imperial Seat, it then obtained as signal an Ecclesiastical, as Secular Grandeur. Socrat. Hist. l. 1. c. 12.

It was the design of the First *Constantinopolitane* Synod to match the See of *Constantinople* with that of *Rome*; this being allowed a Priority of Place, not a Superiority of Office, of Authority.

Constantinople

Conſtantinople is ranked with *Rome*, not ſubjected under it, It levels, truckles not.

Concil. Conſtant. 1. ca 5. The reaſon of the Equality of Dignity is expreſt in the Council it ſelf, becauſe that *Conſtantinople* is New *Rome*, enjoying the ſame Enſigns, Rights, Honours, as

Sozom. l. 7. c. 9. *Sozomen* clearly teſtifies.

Theodoret. l. 5. c. 9. The Epiſtle of the Firſt *Conſtantinopolitane* Council is directed to the Reverend Brethren and Colleagues, *Damaſus*, *Aurelius*, &c.

If the Canon debated eſtabliſh his Parity, it's vainly cited by *H. T.* If it doth not eſtabliſh it, it is vainly granted to the *Romaniſts*.

H. T. *The firſt* Epheſine *Council defined againſt* Neſtor, *who denied the Bleſſed Virgin to be the Mother of God.* c. 1, 2, 3, 4.

It defined that Peter *was the Head and Prince of the Apoſtles; and that the Power of Looſing and binding Sins was given by our Lord to St.* Peter, *who (in his Succeſſors) Lives and Exerciſes Judgment to this very Time, and Always*, Act. 3.

W. T. Here is produced a double Teſtimony out of the firſt *Epheſine* Council: The one a Condemnation of the *Neſtorian* Hereſie, the other a Certificate of the Supremacy of St. *Peter*, and his pretended Succeſſors.

The firſt is not Controverted between the *Romaniſts* and the Reformed.

The ſecond is but a Shadow at the beſt, but a varniſh of a Proof, as it is deſtitute of ſubſtance and ſolidity, ſo of Truth and Candour.

The *Epheſine* Council decreed no ſuch flaunting Title, no Principality of St. *Peter*, nor Entail to his Succeſſors; but it was inſolently uttered by one of the Three Legates of *Celeſtine* the Biſhop of *Rome*, by *Philip* a Candidate for Promotion, a Paraſite of the Court of *Rome*.

Neither

Neither *Arcadicus* nor *Projectus* the other Legates more circumspect dignifyed, offered any such expression. Not any of the Fathers in that Council.

Their Epistle to *Celestinus* Bishop of *Rome*, is directed συλλειτούργῳ, to their fellow Minister.

Not only the Fathers then assembled in General, but in Special, *Juvenalis* Bishop of *Jerusalem* a part so recites him.

The Decree of the Council against *Nestorius* by the Prelates Convened (as it is recorded by *Evagrius*) mentions *Celestinus* a Colleague. Evagr. l. 1. c. 4.

The Epistle of *Celestinus* himself to *Nestorius* expresses *Cyrill* his Brother, and fellow-Bishop. Conc. Eph. 1. Tom. 1. c. 17.

This was not a Courtesie, a Complement of his Condescension, like the smooth insinuation of the *Roman* Generals in the Camp, *Commilitones*, Fellow-Souldiers; many of the Fathers rank them with equal respect in their distinct suffrages recounted in that Council.

It was their Universal, Unanimous Acclamation. One *Celestine*, one *Cyrill*, one Faith of the Synod, one Faith of the World.

Nay, *Theodosius* the Emperour, who Summoned, Authorized, Establisht that Council, having occasion to mention both these Prelates, first nominates *Cyrill*, afterwards *Celestinus*; the former set out with the flourish of an *Epithet* (The Most Holy Bishop of *Alexandria*,) the other without it. Concil. Eph. 1. To. 5. c. 4.

If *H. T.* hath not consulted with the Records of the first *Ephesine* Council, he is precipitate in his Allegation: (No Man passeth a right judgment upon that whereof he is ignorant, saith *Aristotle.*) If he hath consulted with that Council, he is disingenuous in misrepresenting it. οὐδεὶς καλῶς κρίνει ἃ μὴ γινώσκει Arist. Eth. l. 5.

Since *H. T.* produceth the first *Ephesine* Council as an Oracle in a Subject that will not consist with its Test. I shall recommend it in an instance that will, In the Case of the *Cyprian* Bishop oppreſt by the Encroachment of the Patriarch of *Antioch*.

The Controverſie was Exactly Diſcuſs't, Authoritatively Determined in that Council. The Deciſion doth by infallible conſequence vindicate the Immunity of the *Britiſh* Biſhops, doth brand and condemn the Uſurpations of the *Roman*.

We have the ſame plea of Exemption, the pureſt Primitive Antiquity, before the firſt Council of *Epheſus* before the firſt of *Nice*.

As for the claims, the pretences of any ſucceeding Ages; the Canon of the firſt *Epheſine* Council is not to be evaded.

That no Biſhop occupy another Province, which formerly, and from the beginning was not under the power of him or his Predeceſſors.

The ſame Council preſcribes Reſtitution if there be any ſuch injurious attempt, enjoynes the preſervation of Ancient Rights (ἐξ ἀρχῆς) from the beginning in every Province.; for the prevention of the contempt of the Canons of the Fathers, and of the Introduction of Arrogance in the Dreſs, the diſguiſe of Secular Power.

H. T. *The Council of* Chalcedon *defined againſt* Eutyches *and* Dioſcorus, *who denyed Two Natures in Chriſt, Affirming, That the Humane Nature was changed into the Divine.*

W. T. This Arrow is ſhot at random, it wounds not, Lights not near the Proteſtants, who diſclaim, deteſt the *Eutychian* Hereſie.

H. T. *In the third Action in this Council, Pope* Leo *is called Univerſal Arch-Biſhop, and Patriarch of old* Rome.

W. T. This was the ſoothing Addreſs to *Leo* of particular Perſons, ſuch as moved in the loweſt Spheres of the Church; of *Athanaſius* a Presbyter, of *Diodorus* and *Iſchyrion* two Deacons (ſeverally) No ſuch Determination,

mination, no ſuch Expreſſion of the Synod it ſelf. If this Style of Univerſal Arch-Biſhop were of any importance, it might be more vigorouſly pleaded in behalf of the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*: To whom it is applyed by more Numerous, Illuſtrious Perſons, not only by the Monks of *Antioch*, but alſo by the *Syrian* Biſhops in the fifth General Council; nay, by the Synod it ſelf.

Domino noſtro Sanctiſſimo & Beatiſſimo Patri Patrum Archiepiſcopo & Oecumenico Patriarchæ Johanni *Synod. in hâc Imperiali civitate Congregatâ.*

This Title paramount was no Novelty, no Rarity in the ſecond Council of *Nice*, as to the Application of it, to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*.

Pope *Adrian* was not ſhy to aſcribe it to *Tharaſius*: Pope *Gregory* the Firſt aſſerts that all his Predeceſſors have rejected this Title.

Adrianus dilecto fratri Tharaſio *generali Patriarchæ.* Greg. l. 7. Ep. 32.

H. T. *Sentence is pronounced againſt* Dioſcorus *in the Name of* Leo *and St.* Peter, *to acknowledge* Leo *to be St.* Peters *Succeſſor.*

W. T. This is not Extant, not in the propoſition of the Edict, not in the Sentence of the Condemnation, (the cenſure of *Dioſcorus*) not in the Synodical Publication to the Clergy of *Alexandria*; not in the relation, the account of it to the Empreſs *Pulcheria*.

It was only the arrogant Tumor of the Popes Legates, when they pronounced their Suffrages: None of the Fathers then aſſembled, utter'd any ſuch Ranting *Preface* of Preheminence, but they ſorted, ranked together the Arch-Biſhop of Old and New *Rome*, as appears by their Votes diſtinctly Recounted.

H. T. *The* Elibertine *Council in* Spain *ſubſcribed by* Hoſius *and others, who were preſent at the firſt* Nicene

Council, defined, That Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons ſhould abſtain from their Wives, or elſe be degraded. c. 33. Age the Fourth.

W. T. The *Romaniſts* themſelves have little veneration for the Dictates of this Council. Some diſguſt it as imbittered with the *Novatian Leaven.*

Concilium Elibertinum nunquam ab Eccleſia receptum. ob Can. 36. *forte etiam ob* Can. 34. Tom. 1. Conc. pag. 502.

In the Edition of the Councils at *Venice* by *Dominicus Nicolinus*, there is this Remark upon it. It was never received by the Church for the Thirty ſixth Canon, perhaps alſo for the Thirty Fourth.

Minimè confirmatum, & in aliis decretis videtur erroneum eſſe, præſertim cum in pluribus caſibus, ne in articulo quidem mortis velit abſolvi pœnitens. Bellarm. cap. 19. de Imag. Sanct. l. 2.

Bellarmine taxeth it to be invalid, being not confirmed, to be Erroneous. in ſome caſes denying Abſolution to Cenitents in the Extremities of Death.

The moſt Learned *Romiſh* Champions do either abſolutely reject this Council, or at leaſt derogate from the Vigour and Luſtre of it.

This being a Provincial Council of Nineteen Biſhops, its Decrees are no Deciſions of Controverſies.

The Inference of *H. T.* is not convincing in Logick, being deduced from an Inſinuated Errour in Chronology. (That this Council was ſubſcribed by *Hoſius* and others, who were preſent at the firſt *Nicene* Council.) The moſt exact Chronologers date the *Elibertine* Council a conſiderable time before the *Nicene* Council; Twelve years before the Computation of *Onuphrius*, Twenty years more Ancient in the Calculation of *Baronius.*

Though

Though *Bellarmine* would not nominate the preciſe years, yet he confidently aſſerts the *Elibertine* to have been celebrated before the firſt *Nicene*.

Reveta Concilium Celebratum fuit ante Nicenum. Bellar. c. 2. de Imag. Sanct. l. 2.

This being granted, the *Elibertin* had the precedency of Age, it is evident, That what *Hoſius* did leſs conſiderately ſolemnly aſcribe to in a Provincial Council, he did more maturely Authoritatively correct in a General Council.

Were the *Elibertine* Council ſubſequent in time to the firſt *Nicene*; yet what is eſtabliſht in an Oecumenical Council, cannot be repealed in a Provincial, eſpecially in the inſtance recited; the General Council being both Ample and Authentique; the Provincial ſcanted for Number, not unqueſtioned, nor unblemiſht for Repute.

H. T. *The Second Council of* Arles *defined. That no Man who was married could be made a Prieſt, unleſs a Converſion be promiſed.* Can. 2.

W. T. The Decrees of this Council have been frequently, and not unwarrantably taxed to be adulterated.

This Council mentions the *Bonaſiaques* (c. 17.) not then Extant, not before the time of Pope *Innocent* the Firſt, the Eighth in Succeſſion after *Sylveſter*, in whoſe Papacy you acknowledge this Council to be held.

This Second Council of *Arles* recites the *Vaſenſe* Council, Convened not till above an entire Century of years afterwards in the time of Pope *Leo* the Firſt. Concil. Arel. 2. c. 28.

Were

Were this Council of *Arles* as managed in the Tranſactions, and as conveighed to us in the Records of it uncorrupted, yet it was but a Provincial Council in *France*, (as the *Elibertine* cited was in *Spain*) which muſt vail to an Oecumenical, to the firſt *Nicene*; wherein when there was an active eſſay of eſtabliſhing a Sanction for ſeparating the Clergy from their Wives μὴ συγκαθεύδειν, not to ſleep together; *Paphnutius* that famous Confeſſor vigorouſly oppoſed, prevailed for the rejecting of that Novel Impoſition.

Socrat. l. 1. c. 8. Sozom. l. 1. c. 22. This is atteſted by *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, whoſe Teſtimonies have in former Ages been venerable, though cavilled at by *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, and other Romaniſts of the ſame ſtrain, whoſe Artifice it is to evade, to ſhift off thoſe pregnant proofs they cannot ſatisfie, and will not acknowledge.

Claud. Eſpencæus l. 1. *de continentiâ.* Theſe Authorities are ſufficiently vindicated by *Eſpencæus*.

In this Illuſtrious Inſtance of *Paphnutius*, to deal candidly as a Son of the Church of *England*, and not as a Sophiſter in the School of *Athens*.

An Adverſary may object, That the ſame *Paphnutius* did propound, That they who were Ordained being unmarried ſhould ſo perſevere.

I Anſwer,

Paphnutius did divide that Stream, that Torrent which he could not entirely divert.

He declared his Judgment punctually, That Conjugal Society is not inconſiſtent with Sacred Orders, (without any reſtriction to precedent or ſubſequent.)

He avouched not only the difficulty but in ſome the impoſſibility of the obſervance of ſo rigid an interdict of the Clergies Marriage, and therein undermined the Socrat. l. 1. c. 8. foundation

foundation of the *Romish* restraint, he also pressed the impurity of the consequences of such a prohibition. The Prophecy of *Paphnutius* became St. *Bernards* History. The result was, that the Manacle was cast off, every Man left to the liberty of his own Judgment.

Abstinentes remedio Nuptiali, & in omne deinceps flagitium effluentes. Bern. de Conv. ad Cler. c. 29, Sozom. l. 1. c. 22. Socrat. l. 1. c. 4.

It may further be urged by an Opponent, That *Paphnutius* mentioned the Ancient Tradition of the Church. For the Clergy that were unmarryed, to abstain from Wedlock.

I Answer,

That *Paphnutius* did herein most probably reflect upon the Church of *Egypt*, (wherein himself was dignified) or on *Thessaly*. It might be the particular custom of one Province, not Universal of all.

There was no such Tradition in *Armenia*, if the Sixth *Constantinopolitane* Council may be credited.

Quoniam cognovimus in Armeniorum *Regione eos solum in cleri ordinem referri qui sunt ex genere Sacerdotali.* Conc. Constant. 6. Can. 33.

No such Tradition in *Ephesus* (the Metropolis of the lesser *Asia*.) Before the end of the 2d. Century, *Policrates* Bishop of *Ephesus* in his contest, touching the Observation of *Easter* with *Victor*, Bishop of *Rome*, in an Epistle to him, asserts Seven of his Progenitors to have been his Predecessors in that Episcopal Seat. (*His Parents in* Rufinus's *Interpretation.*)

Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 5. c. 24.

No such Tradition in *Corinth* or in *Creet*. When *Pinitus* would have introduced it among the *Cretians*, *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth* reprehended, disswaded it as a grievous pressure, not to be imposed as a necessary Duty, but that the Infirmities of many were to be regarded.

μὴ βαρὺ φορτίον ἐπάναγκες τὸ περὶ ἁγνείας τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐπιτιθέναι, τῆς δὲ τῶν πολλῶν καταστοχάζεσθαι ἀσθενείας. Euseb. l. 4. c. 23.

No

Aliter se habet traditio Orientalium Ecclesiarum, aliter hujus S. Romanæ *Ecclesiæ. Nam illarum Sacerdotes, Diaconi, aut subdiaconi matrimonio Copulantur.* Dist. 3.

No such Tradition in the *Eastern* Churches, according to the Authentick Record of the Canon Law, the Decretal of Pope *Stephen*.

No such custom in *Cyprus*, the Renowned *Spiridion*, being Bishop, had Wife and Children; not thereby empaired or eclipsed as to the discharging of the Exercises of Divinity, the Sacred Offices of his Function.

ὐ τὰ θεῖα χείρων. Sozom. l. 1. c. 11.

No such received Tradition in the *Africane* Churches, wherein *Tertullian* was a Married Presbyter, as also among many others, *Fœlix* and *Numidicus*, both themselves and their Consorts, reputably recited by St. *Cyprian*.

Cyprian. l. 4. Ep. 10. l. 5. Ep. 15.

No such custom (as not in the Modern) not in the Ancient *Greek* Churches, wherein the Father of St. *Basil* the Great, the Father of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, his Brother St. *Gregory Nyssen*, *Apollinaris*, *Synesius*, were Married Prelates, and co-habited with their Wives.

Sacerdotes illâ Tempestate uxores publicè sicut cæteri Christiani habebant. Et filios procreabant. De Germ. ait Avent. in Hist. Boiorum. l. 5. in Anno 1074.

No stamp of any such Tradition in *Germany*, not in *England*, no track of any such custom for 1000 years after Christ.

Even in *France*, where the Scene of the Objection is laid from the Council of *Arles* about the midst of the Fourth Century St. *Hilary* was Bishop of *Poiteirs*, St. *Prosper* Bishop of *Aquitane*, both Marryed.

De Britannis *testantur* Fabianus in Chron. p. 263. Floren. in Chron. ad Annum 997. Novel. Const. 8

Justinian the Emperour, about the beginning of the 6th Century extolled *Epiphanius*, Bishop of *Constantinople* for his Extraction from Priests.

This was the Pedigree of several Popes of *Boniface* the First, of *Fœlix* the Third, *Gelasius* the First, *Agapetus* the First, *Sylverius*, *Deus dedit*, *Theodorus*, *Hadrian* the Second, *Agapetus* the Second.

This

This is atteſted by *Platina* a Witneſs beyond exception.

That theſe were no ſpurious Progeny is avouched by *Gratian.* De legitimis Conjugiis Nati Cap. Cenamenſi.

I confeſs many of the Clergy, in the beſt, the pureſt Ages of the Primitive Church did wave Marriages, but it was voluntary out of Choice, not neceſſary upon preſcription; none were debarred Matrimony in Sacred Orders, none were branded for it. Socr. l. 5. c. 22.

This is aſſented to by Learned *Romaniſts*, I ſhall inſtance only in the Teſtimonies of two Cardinals, *Hugo* and *Bonaventure.* *Tunc licebat Sacerdotes habere uxores.* Hug. Card. in 1 Tim. 3.

The Matrimonial reſtraint to the Clergy was firſt attempted by *Siricius* the Pope, in the declining of the Fourth Century, afterwards earneſtly endeavoured to be re-eſtabliſhed by ſeveral of his Succeſſors in multiplyed Decrees, but not without Regrets, Oppoſitions, Tumults. *Tunc non fuit indicta clericis continentia.* Bonav. 4. d. 81. q. 3.

No ſolemn Univerſal Sanction obtruded before *Gregory* the Seventh, (called *Hildebrand*) in the Eleventh *Century.* He who firſt aſſumed to himſelf a power of Excommunicating and depoſing Princes, did not ſtick peremptorily to prohibit the Marriages of all Prieſts, and to brand all their Miniſterial Offices, notoriouſly claſhing with the Canon of the Ancient Council of *Gangre*, though a Provincial Convention, yet of Oecumenical Approbation, ſolemnly approved by Pope *Leo* the Fourth. *Lego & Relego* Romanorum *Regum & imperatorum* Geſta, *at nunquam inveni quenquam eorum ante Hunc.* (Hen. 4.) *à* Rom. *Pontifice Excommunicatum vel regno Privatum*

Otto Friz. l. 6. ca. 35. *Ut pace omnium dixerim, Hec ſola Novitas non dicam hæretici nec dum in Mundo.* Sigebert in Anno 1088. Conc. Gangr. can. 4. Greg. Sept. *uxoratos Sacerdotes à Divino removit officio, & Laicos miſſam eorum audire interdixit in annum* 1075.

I ſhall not quit this Perſecutor of the Marryed Clergy without two Remarks of fame.

Distinct. 20. ca. de Libellis Lamb. Schaf. Hist. Germ.

The one touching the lasciviousness, licentiousness of his Life, his scandalous Converse with the grand Countess *Maud.*

Confessus in Extremis suis valde se peccasse in Pastorali curâ & suadente Diabolo contra genus Humanum Odium & iram irritatum. Florent. Monach. Vego in Chronico ad annum 1106.

The other touching his Stings of Conscience at his Death, which then impeacht him for exerting his Tyranny by the Instigation of the Devil.

Novum prorsus conversionis Genus, Licita non faciunt, illicita committunt. Temperare à conjugio, non Temperare à Rapinâ. Quid agis stulta persuasio? Peccata interdixit Deus, non Matrimonia. Item non est Conversio sed Aversio: Qui jampridem ut fama est opus Honesti Matrimonii relinquitis, tandem à Scelere cessate. Salv. l. 5. *de Provid. Experientiâ docente Contrarius Effectus sequitur ex illâ Lege continentiæ, cùm hodie non vivant spiritualiter, nec sint mundi, sed maculentur illicito coitu cum eorum gravissimo peccato, ubi cum propriâ uxore esset castitas. Unde deberet Ecclesia facere sicut bonus Medicus, si Medicina experientiâ docente potius officiat quàm prosit eam tollere nemo remanit citius.*

Not to digress too far, I shall dismiss the Canon of the Council of *Arles*, quoted by *H. T.* with the Observation or descant of St. *Salvian* a Pious *French* Bishop before the period of the Fifth Century in a polite allusion to the Phrase of the Decree. *A new sort of Conversion. They do not things lawful, they omit things unlawful. They forbear from Wedlock, and forbear not Rapine. What act'st thou, O foolish perswasion? God hath forbidden Sins, not Marriages. In like manner it is not a Conversion, but an Aversion. You that long since as it is famed, relinquish the work of honest Matrimony, at length desist from Mischief.*

Sacerdotibus magnâ ratione sublatas Nuptias, majore restituendas videri: Platina in Vitâ Pii Secundi.

The prodigious Enormities of Lusts which have been occasioned by the debarring the Clergy the Innocent Expedient of Gods Sacred Ordinance, hath extorted the Pathetical Complaints of many Conscientious *Romanists*, and excited their ardent desires, That this rigid Imposition were Repealed, and Primitive Liberty Restored. There being as Pope *Pius* the Second (when he was *Æneas Sylvius* the Cardinal) profest, greater reason for the Restitution, the Release, than the Restraint. The

The cauſe of the one being of a Secular Stamp to prevent the Penury of the Clergy, to be leſs contemptible in the eſtimate of Men: The Motive of the other is to promote purity, not to be vile, execrable in the ſight of God.

As there is a Virginal, ſo there is a Matrimonial Chaſtity.

Conjugal Society is no repugnancy to Grace, no pollution to Holy Orders; the Apoſtle having vindicated the Marriage Bed in all to be undefiled, being not depraved in it ſelf, it is not ſullyed: Where there is no guilt, there is no ſtain. Hebr. 13. 4.

Both the School-men and Canoniſts acknowledged, that the Clergy are debarred from Wedlock, not by any Divine, not by any Apoſtolical, but only by a humane poſitive Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution. Gratian. diſt. 28. c. Diaconi. & diſt. 31. c. Aliter Aquin. q. 80. Art. 11.

It is the Law of no Church but the *Roman*, herein not ſwayed by Sacred, Spiritual, but by Prophane Temporal Intereſts. Cajetan. in Opuſc. To. 1. Tract. 27. *Eſt communis Sententia Theologorum veterum & Recentiorum.* Azor. p. 1. Inſt. Mor. l. 13. c. 11.

To indulge, to licenſe what God deteſts; Condemns (Fornication) to make Stores, Revenues, to raiſe Treaſures out of Impurities (in a more unſavoury, than extracting of Gold out of the Dung of *Ennius*.) And to prohibit to doom in the Clergy what God allows, juſtifies in all, may paſs for the Traffick, the Policy, but not the Virtue, the Innocency of the Church of *Rome*.

H. T. *Catholick Profeſſors to the Year* 500.

Severinus, Tigrius, Exuperius, Eutropius, St. Jo. Chryſoſtome, Paulinus, Mauritius, St. Auguſtine, Maximus, Zozimus, Vincentius, Lirinenſis, Jacobus Perſa, Alexius, *St.* Cyril *of* Alexandria, Urſula *with* 11000 *Virgins*, Proſper, Honoratus, Palladius, Bonifacius, Euthymius, Simon Stelites, Chryſologus, Patricius, Eugenius, Fulgentius, Boetius, Epiphanius, Tirinenſis, Severinus, &c.

The Scots *converted by* Palladius, *the* French *by* S. Remigius *and* Vedaſtus, 4979 *Martyrs of* Africa, *and many others.*

W. T. This Catholick band is a ſpecious, but probably a falſe Muſter, wherein *Urſula* leads the Van to 11000 Virgins.

This being ſtrictly inſpected will appear an imaginary Romance, not a real Tranſaction.

There is a double proof offered, the one is Fanatical, the other fabulous.

The firſt conſiſts in Viſions, in the Revelations of St. *Elizabeth*, (in the *Romiſh* Style and Kalendar) and of *Richardus Præmonſtratenſis.*

This is the grand ſupport of the *Coten* Divinity, the Pageantry of its Sepulchres, ſo much blazed and gloried in: *Ad populum phaleras.*

The moſt circumſpect, ingenuous *Romaniſts*, bluſh to own the Originals and the products of the vain *Enthuſiaſms* in this Inſtance.

The Viſions preſented being exactly diſcuſt, are unmaskt to be Dreams; the Revelations convicted, to be Colluſions.

The ſecond Argument for avouching *Urſula* and her numerous illuſtrious Train is the Allegation of an Hiſtorical Evidence, wherein there is no credible, no rational account given to ſatisfie a judicious Inquiſitor.

The beſt Author that *Baronius* upon the moſt induſtrious ſearch could light on, was *Geoffry* of *Monmouth* (more reputably called *Galfridus Aſaphenſis*) whom all Hiſtorians that mention brand for an Impoſtor: *Baronius* himſelf (in other ſubjects) gives him no better character.

Licet multa de aliis habeat Auctor Fabuloſa. Baron. Tom. 4. Annal. in An. 383. Even *Galfridus* (the prime Oracle for this Fable.) could offer no better flouriſh of a Teſtimony, than the Coton. Inſtit. l. 1. c. 19. *Incidit in Librum quendam* Britanicum *ab homine cujus adhuc Nomen ignoratur conſcriptum, ac ſpurciſſimis ſcatentem, quem latinum ille fecit.* De Galfrido, Alanus Copus. Dial. 5. c. 19.

obſcure

obſcure Authority of *Anonymus*, one of no Name, of no Eſteem, conſequently of no Credit.

No Ancient Hiſtorian of the Third, the Fourth or Fifth Century (wherein the Sience is variouſly laid) nor in ſome ſubſequent Ages, recites the Martyrdom, or Saintſhip of *Urſula*, and her vaſt Virginal Retinue.

There is no Harmony among the Aſſerters of it, touching the Age, Whether in the Fifth Century, where *H.T.* and others place it (in the year 454) or in the Fourth Century, where *Baronius* fixes it (in the year 383) or in the Third Century, where the *Ciſtertian* Breviary diſpoſeth it (in the year 237.)

There is no conſent touching *Urſula's* Extraction, her Habitation, whether her Native Soil were *England* (being as it is pretended courted to be the Bride of an *Engliſh* Prince;) or *Scotland*, (according to *Wicelius's* Poetry; or *Ireland*, according to the Vindication of *Combachius.*) Thus where there is no Truth, there is no Stability, no Concord.

Sigebertus (in his uncorrupt Edition) *Petrus de Natalibus*, *Boniſinius*, with other Hiſtorians and Chronologers reject the ſolemn Narrative, touching *Urſula* as an Elaborate Fiction.

Miræus Edition of Sigebert at Antwerp. Bonfin. Hungar. rerum Decad. 1. l. 5.

If the Argument of *Baronius* be Negatively firm to diſcard *Cyriacus* from being Biſhop of *Rome*, and an Aſſociate of *Urſula*, becauſe no ſuch Paſſage Extant in any Ancient Record; The Proof is not invalid upon the ſame Topick for diſcountenancing, expunging the whole Legend of *Urſula*. *Una litura ſat eſt.*

Baron. Annal. ad Annum 237.

Let it be ſuppoſed, That *Urſula* and her Eleven Thouſand Virgins were not Theatrical, but Real Saints and Martyrs; yet *Britiſh* they were, not *Romiſh*.

The

The *Britain* Church did neither in the Firſt, Second, Third, Fourth, or Fifth Century ſubmit to the *Roman*, nor conform to it, not in its Liturgy; not in its Rituals, its Canons; not in point of Ordination of Prieſts, of the Prohibition of their Matrimony, not in the Obſervation of Eaſter.

So little a Correſpondence there was in matters Eccleſiaſtical, betwixt them; That *Gregory* the Firſt was ignorant and inquiſitive (in the Teſtimony of *Paulus Diaconus*) whether the *Britains* were *Chriſtians* or *Pagans*.

The inſerting by *H. T.* of Four Thouſand Nine Hundred and Seventy Nine Martyrs of *Africa* is as wide an Impertinency of a Liſt of Catholick Profeſſors of the *Roman* Stamp. St. *Auſtin* who is diſtinctly nominated in the Catholick Catalogue, for this Age, did ſubſcribe to the Decrees of the Council of *Carthage*, which did exclude the *Romiſh* Juriſdiction in *Africa*.

St. *Chryſoſtome* who is expreſly cited, was a Catholick Profeſſor of the *Greek*, not the *Roman* Church.

He was not ignorant of the Firſt *Conſtantinopolitane* Oecumenical Council, which ranked him, being *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, with the *Patriarch* of *Rome*.

His Epiſtles Firſt and Second to Pope *Innocentius*, do not derogate from this Equality. (As the *Romaniſts* object.) They declare a voluntary Reſpect, not a due ſubmiſſion.

In his Exigencies he made the See of *Rome* his Sanctuary for Refuge, for Aſſiſtance, not his Tribunal for Sentence.

His Addreſs to Pope *Innocentius*, was as to an Orthodox Prelate, not as to a Supream Judge.

His Devoir, Reſort, his Appeal was not to a Papal, but a Synodical Determination.

To ſumm up the *Britiſh*, *African*, *Greek* Catholick Profeſſors produced, they are unjuſtly challenged, appropriated

propriated by *H. T.* They were at a great distance from the Ancient City of *Rome*, but at a much greater from the Modern Church of *Rome*, as it is Establisht in the *Trentine* Council.

H. T. From the Year of Christ 500.

Chief Pastors.	*General Councils.*
514 Hormisda. 524 Johannes 1. 526 Fœlix 4. 530 Bonifacius 2. 532 Johannes 2. 535 Agapetus. 437 Sylverius. 540 Vigilius. 526 Pelagius 1. 560 Johannes 3. 573 Benedictus 1. 578 Pelagius 2. 590 Gregorius Magnus.	*The Second* Constantinopolitane *Council, Pope* Vigilius *presiding* (*Fathers* 165, *An. Dom.* 553) *against* Anthimius *and* Theodorus. *Authors* Zonaras, Nicephorus, *and* Baronius.

W. T. As for the Eleven Popes nominated, they were no Afferters of the Tenets wherein the Reformed differ from the present Church of *Rome*.

As for *Vigilius*'s Precedency in the Second *Constantinopolitane* Council, *H. T.* is more positive than *Bellarmine* would adventure to be, who warily makes the point of Right, a κρησφύγετον, an Evasion, lest the point of Fact should be disproved (that he did or might preside in it.)

In Concilio aut præfuisse aut præesse potuisse Vigilium. Bellarm.

As

Papam tributre Concilio ſuum eſſe & Formam ait Turrecrem. l. 3. c. 4. *Pondus Conciliis dat ſummi Pontificis gravitas & Authoritas.* Canus l. 5. c. 5.

As for the Papal Intereſt of Preſidency in Councils, which *Turrecremata* exacts for the Form, the Eſſence, and *Canus* for the Weight, and Validity of ſuch Aſſemblies: There is no Conſtitution, no Preſcription for it in the pureſt Antiquity.

Non invenitur inſtantia in Octo Conciliis præterquam in tertia Actione Concil. Chalced. Cuſan. l. 3. c. 16.

Cardinal *Cuſanus*, being Convinced with ſo evident a Truth, ingenuouſly acknowledged, That in the Primitive Oecumenical Councils there is but a ſingle Inſtance, and that in the Third Action of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which Exception is not warranted by the Genuine Records of that Council, were it allowed, yet according to the Rational Maxim of the Civil Law. An Exception ratifies the Rule in what is not excepted by this Conſequence, the alledged Preſidency of *Vigilius* is infallibly diſcarded; for Vindication whereof, *H. T.* produceth Three Witneſſes, *Zonaras*, *Nicephorus*, *Baronius*.

Exceptio firmat Regulam in non Exceptis Reg. jur.

Theſe are defective in point of Antiquity, and thereby leſs credible.

The Second *Conſtantinopolitane* Council was Convened the Year 553, (as *H. T.* profeſſes) whereas the Teſtimonies produced are of a much later Date. *Zonaras* wrote in the Twelfth Century, *Nicephorus* in the Thirteenth, *Baronius* in the laſt.; who was no leſs the Advocate of the Papacy, than the Annaliſt of the Church, too frequently Adulterating the Records of Antiquity, and proſtituting them to the Grandeur of the See of *Rome*.

Vigilius *per literas Conſenſit Concilio, non tamen intereſſe voluit.* Evagr. l. 4. c. 37.

Evagrius a more Ancient Authentick Hiſtorian before the end of the Sixth Century, teſtifies the Conſent of *Vigilius* by his Letters (an Orthodox Correſpondence of Judgment, no Authoritative Confirmation of Power) he was ſo far from preſiding in that Council, that he would not be preſent at it. H. T.

H. T. Produces three Witneſſes, not without ſome grains of a Sophiſter, he cites the Firſt *Zonaras*, as the Tempter did the *Pſalmiſt*, imperfectly.

Zonaras joyns *Eutychius* of *Conſtantinople*, *Apollinarius* of *Alexandria*, as Princes (or Principal Prelates) in that Council, moſt probably ſo Titled in reſpect of their Patriarchal Dignity, without any mention of any diſtinct peculiar Perſonal preſidency. Zonar. in Vitâ Juſtiniani.

The Second Witneſs *Nicephorus* doth not aver *Vigilius* to be Preſident of that Council, but *Menas* and *Eutychius* ſucceſſively the one in the Beginning, the other in the Progreſs and Cloſe of the Council. Niceph. l. 17. c. 27.

Vigilius repaired to *Conſtantinople*, but not to the Council, though frequently intreated, importuned, yet ineffectually; he abſented himſelf upon ſeveral pretences of Indiſpoſition of Body (really of mind) of the ſmall Number of *Weſtern* Biſhops, of the invalidity of which reaſon, he was ſufficiently convinced. Whereas the true concealed Reaſon confeſſed by *Nicephorus*, was the Stomach of *Vigilius*, that he could not brook to be Eclipſed by the Bright Luſtre of the Arch-Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, being Preſident.

Claranza the Abbreviator of the Councils Devoted to the *Romiſh* Intereſt, aſſerts the Preſidency of *Menas* in the front of the Second *Conſtantinopolitane* Council. This is cleared beyond diſpute by the Acts of the Council it ſelf, wherein is inſerted, *Menas* being Preſident, προκαθεζομένου, will admit no other Conſtruction. Conſtantinop. Synodus quintâ Præſidente Mennâ Patriarchâ Caranza in ſumma Conc. 56. Conc. Conſt. 2. Act. prima.

Baronius himſelf (the Third Witneſs quoted) produced this Record. Baron. in Ann. 553.

I H. T.

H. T. *The Second* Constantinopolitane *Council defined, That our Lord Jesus Christ Crucified in the Flesh, is both the True Lord of Glory, and one of the Holy Trinity,* Can. 10. *against* Peter *the Arch-Bishop of* Constantinople, *who held that the whole Trinity was Crucified for us, as appears* Art. 1.

It defined One Divine Nature to be in all Three Persons, Can. 1. 2. *Nativities in Christ,* c. 2. *One only Person to be in Christ, though two distinct Natures, against* Anthimius *annd* Theodor. Can. 4. 5.

It defined against Theodore, *That Christ was not troubled with Passions in the Mind, or Concupiscences of the Flesh,* Can. 12.

W. T. This is a Digression from the Controversie. No Heresie condemned in the Second *Constantinopolitane* Council is Espoused in the Reformed Churches.

H. T. *In this Age the Third Council of* Carthage *Decreed, That the Sacrament of the Altar (Mass) but by such only as were fasting,* Can. 29. *It approved the whole Catalogue of Canonical Books by name, as they are now published in our Bible, and approved by the Catholick Church, except only* Baruch, *which is not named, because an Appendix to* Jeremy, *whose Secretary he was,* Can. 47. *This Council was subscribed by St.* Augustine, *and approved in the Sixth General Synod.*

W. T. The Time of the Sacraments Celebration is no point Controverted.

The *Romanists* dissent touching the Numerical Synod of *Carthage,* wherein the latter Canon produced, the Forty Seventh was Established; whether in the Third, or in the Seventh Council of *Carthage.*

Most

Moſt refer it to the Third; yet among them there is a difference touching the Date of it.

Some fix it in the year 387, others in the year 419, but *H. T.* degrades it to a lower Station within the Circuit of the Sixth Century, and thereby renders its Teſtimony the leſs Venerable.

The *Romiſh* Doctors ſet no grand Eſtimate on the Dictates of this Council.

The Twenty Third Canon, (That Prayer be always directed to God the Father at the Altar) conſiſts not with the Judgment or Practice of the Church of *Rome.*

The *Miſſal* ſolemnly directs a Devout Addreſs to the Lamb of God.

The Second Canon, That a Biſhop of a prime Seat be not called Prince of Prieſts, or Chief Prieſts, *&c.*) doth derogate from the Supream Eccleſiaſtical Prehemi-nence challenged due to the *Roman* Papacy: In the vindicating whereof, whilſt *Gratian* Recites this Canon, he prevaricates in a Parentheſis (The Biſhop of *Rome* excepted.) This Addition being ſhuffled in without any Warrant from the Council it ſelf.

Others upon this occaſion depretiate the Council as being Provincial only, that could not tranſmit any Obligation from *Africa* to *Rome.* As not to *Rome*, ſo not to *Britain* neither.

As it had the force of a Provincial Council only for the Twenty-Third, Twenty-Sixth Canons, ſo for the Forty-Seventh alſo objected by *H. T.* Not only to poize, but to down-weigh the Third Council of *Carthage*: I ſhall ſet in the oppoſite Scale the Synod of *Laodicea*, though not entirely Oecumenical, yet not barely (diminutively)

minutively) Provincial, being a Convention out of divers Provinces of *Asia*; though not more Ancient than the first Council of *Nice*, (according to the computation of *Baronius*, yet it is confest of all hands, that it preceded in time the Third of *Carthage*.

Baron. Annal. in Append. ad Tom. 4.

As to the Confirmation of the Third of *Carthage* by the Sixth General Synod objected, the Council of *Laodicea* sufficiently matches it, and abundantly transcends it in the Ratification of the Fourth Oecumenical Council (that of *Chalcedon*) and in the Primitive Authentick Code establisht in the same Council, that of *Carthage* being first inserted in the Code by *Dionisius Exiguus*, the Abbot in the year 425.

Laodic. Concil. Can. 59.

The same Council of *Laodicea* recounts the same Canonical Books of the Old Testament, (wherein the sole difference consists) which the Church of *England* doth.

That it recites not other Books, but that it rejects them not, is the light Cavil of *Melchior Canus*, not wanting a Confutation, not corresponding with the Phrase or Importance of that Canon.

Τὰ οὖν δι κανονικὰ Βίβλια τοσαῦτα τὸν ἀριθμὸν, εἶναι πιστεύομεν, ὅσα ἡ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ σύνοδος ἀπεφήνατο καὶ ἡ τῦ χριστῦ καθολικὴ καὶ ἡ Ὀρθοδόξη Ἐκκλησία ὑπὸ τῦ παναγίυ πνεύματος φωτισθεῖσα παρακλίτυ παρέντος ὑπαγορεύει ἅπαντα τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βίβλια εἴκοσι δύο. Cyril. Resp. 3.

St. *Cyril* of *Constantinople* lays a main stress upon it, believing the Books of Canon-Scripture to be those which the *Laodicean* Synod hath put down, and which the Orthodox Catholick Church of Christ being Illuminated by the Holy Ghost, hath confest.

But because of the presence of St. *Austin*, and the Authority of the Sixth General Synod produced as Abettors to the Third of *Carthage*, I shall not Explode, but

Interpret

Interpret the Canon produced by *H. T.* offering that Genuine Conſtruction of it, which beſt conforms to the Tracts of St. *Auſtin* (the beſt Evidence of his Judgment) and the beſt Vindication of the Sixth General Council from an implicit contradiction of it ſelf in the approbation of Two Synods (the one of *Laodicea*, the other the Third of *Carthage*, whoſe Canons ſeem to claſh with each other.

The Books excepted by the Church of *England*, not liſted in the Canonical Catalogues (as not in the Church of *Laodicea*.) The Church doth read, (as *Jerome* ſaith) for Example of Life, and Inſtruction of Manners, but yet doth not apply them to Eſtabliſh any Doctrine. Article. 6th.

Cardinal *Cajetane*, the Moſt Learned Textuary and Schoolman, and Caſuiſt in the Church of *Rome* of his Age, gives the ſame account of the Sentiment of St. *Auſtin*, and the Decree of the foremention'd Council of *Carthage*, to wit, That the Books Excluded, may be called Canonical, not for the Confirmation of Faith, but for the Edification of the Faithful.

Non eſſe Canonicos, id eſt, Regulares ad Confirmandum ea quæ ſunt fidei. Poſſe tamen dici Canonicos; Id eſt, Regulares ad ædificationem fidelium utpote in Canone Bibliorum ad hoc receptos & Auctoratos. Cum hâc diſtinctione diſcerni poſſe dicta Auguſtini *Exſcripta in Provinciali Synodo* Carthaginenſi. Cajet. in fine Comment. ad Hiſt. Vet. Teſt.

Melchior Canus reprehended *Cajetane*, for making St. *Jerome* his Rule, and derogates from St. *Jerome*, becauſe he did track *Joſephus* (the Famous Jewiſh *Antiquary*) in the Enumeration of the Canonical Books of Scripture. Canus in loc. Theol. l. 2. c. 11. ad 2. Arg.

It is confeſt by *Driedo*, That St. *Jerom* did herein retain the Computation of the *Jewiſh* Synagogue, not of the *Chriſtian* Church, as he pretends. Dridol. 1. c 3. parte primâ ad Hier.

Andradius

Andrad. l. 3. Def. Tridenc. Ep. ad Rom. c. 3. v. 2.

Andradius acknowledges that St. *Jerome* recited the Opinion of the *Jews*. Their Teſtimony in an Unanimous Conſent is no light fallible Topick for the Canonical Scripture of the Old Teſtament.

Divina Oracula in Sacris Scripturis Contenta. Tolet in Ep. ad c. 3. v. 2.

To them were committed the Oracles of God, to wit, contained in Sacred Scripture. So Cardinal *Tolet* expounds them.

Ita ut non niſi per Judæos *ad* Gentiles *devenerint.* Corn. à Lap. in Ro. 3.

The *Jews*, the Faithful Depoſitories for theſe Jewels, without whom they had not been tranſmitted to the *Gentiles*, is the acknowledgment of *Cornelius à Lapide.*

Auguſtin. *contra* Fauſtum. Man. l. 12. c. 23. Auguſtin. in Pſalm. 56. Euſeb. de Præp. Evang. l. 8. c. 2.

Upon this account St. *Auſtin* called the *Jews*, a *Scriniary* Nation, carrying the Law and the Prophets, and the Library-keeper for Chriſtians: A Truſt which they performed with ſingular fidelity, which I ſhall not need aſſert by the Authority of *Philo*, (cited by *Euſebius*) not of *Origen* and St. *Jerom*, both confeſt Compurgators of the *Jews* Integrity by Learned Romaniſts.

Auguſt. de Civit. Dei. l. 15. c. 13. *Per Religionem voluerunt unquam textum corrumpere* Bellarm. de verbo Dei, l. 2. c. 2.

I ſhall not need to add St. *Auſtins* clear Evidences, nor to muſter up other Witneſſes, Ancient or Modern; ſince *Bellarmine* himſelf was their ſolemn Advocate to acquit them from any aſperſion of Corruption in the preſervation of the Records of Sacred Scripture. They would rather die a Hundred times, ſaith *Bellarmine*, a Thouſand times ſaith *Philo.*

To add more Force and Luſtre to the ſolemn Authentick Suffrages of the *Jews*, it is obſerved, That neither Chriſt, nor any of his Apoſtles in the New Teſtament did cite any paſſage out of thoſe Books which are in the Old Teſtament, Exploded from being Canonical Scripture, by Reformed Churches, called Eccleſiaſtical Books, by St. *Cyprian*, Apocryphal by others.

The

The Primitive Church never Expoſed them for Canonical in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, *viz.* as ſtampt with Divine Inſpiration, as embraced with a true, (not equivocal) Catholick Allowance for a Doctrinal Infallible Teſt.

The grand proofs of Antiquity (beſides the Third diſtruſted Council of *Carthage*) are the ſentiments of two Popes, *Innocentius* the Firſt, and *Gelaſius*. Both which may rationally be ſuſpected for counterfeit Authorities, there being no ſuch extant, till Three Hundred years after the diſſolution of each.

Innocent. 1. in Ep. 3. ad exuperium Concilium Rom. ſub

As for the former, the more clear and Venerable Teſtimony, that of *Innocentius* the Firſt, if there were a reality of his Decree alledged, there needed no probationary reference of the Forty-Seventh Canon in the Third Council of *Carthage*, ſo much inſiſted on to the Judgment of *Bonifacius*, inferiour to *Innocentius* the Firſt for Age, for Repute, and Luſtre.

Hoc etiam Fratri et Conſacerdoti noſtro Bonifacio *vel aliis earum partium Epiſcopis pro confirmando iſto Canone innoteſcat.* Caranz. in Sum. Carth. Concil. Can. 47.

To manifeſt the *Raniſh* Catalogue of Canonical Books of Scripture to be Novel and Unwarrantable; I ſhall conclude this point with the ſummary Recapitulation of Dr. *Coſin*, late Biſhop of *Durham* (after a copious diſtinct examination of particulars.)

Thus have we hitherto taken an exact and perfect view of what the Catholick Church of God hath delivered, concerning the Canon of Divine Scripture in all times, and in all places: In *Judea* by the Ancient Hebrews, by Chriſt himſelf, and by his Holy Apoſtles: In *Paleſtine* and *Syria*, by *Juſtin Martyr*, *Euſebius*, St. *Jerome*, and *Damaſcen*; In the Apoſtolical Churches of *Aſia*, by *Melito Polycrates*, and *Oneſims*; In *Phrygia*, *Cappadocia*, *Lycaonia*, and *Cyprus*; by the Council of *Laodicea*, St. *Baſil*, *Amphilochius*, *Epiphanius*; In *Egypt* by *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, *Origen*, and *Athanaſius*,

Dr. Coſins *Scholaſtical Hiſt. of the Canon of Script.* Parag. 178.

nasius, In the Churches of *Africa*, by *Julius*, *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian*, and St. *Austin*; the Council of *Carthage*, *Junitius*, and *Primasius*; In all the Five Patriarchates by St. *Cyril*, St. *John Chrysostome*, *Anastasius*, St. *Gregory*, *Nicephorus*, and *Balsamon*: In *Greece* by *Dionisius*, *Antiochus*, *Adrianus*, *Lentius*, *Zonaras*, *Philippus* and *Callistus*: In *Italy*, by *Philastrius Rufinus*, *Cassiodore*, *Commestor*, *Balbus*, *Antoninus Mirandula*, *Cajetine* and *Pagnine*; In *Spain* by *Isidore*. *Hugo Cardinalis*, *Paulus Burgensis*, *Tostatus* and *Ximenius*; In *France* by St. *Hilary*; the Divines of *Marseils*, *Victorinus* of *Poictiers*, *Charle Magnes* Bishops, *Agobard*, *Radulphus*, *Honorius*, *Petrus Cluniac*. *Hugo* and *Richardus* of St. *Victors* at *Paris*, *Beleth*, *Petrus Collegn*, *Hervaus Natalis*, *Faber* and *Chlictoveus*; In *Germany*, and the *Low Countreys* by *Rabanus*, *Strabus*, *Hermanus*, *Contract Ado*. *Rupertus*, the Ordinary and Interlineary glosis upon the Bible, the Glosis upon the Canon-Law; *Lyranus*, *Dionysius Carthusianus*, *Driedo* and *Ferus*: And in the Church of *England* by Venerable *Bede*, *Alcuin Giselbert*, *Joh. Sarisburiensis*, *Brito*, *Ocham*, *Thomas Anglicus*, and *Thomas Waldon*, besides divers others that are not here numbred.

Thus far Doctor *Cosin* abbreviates his ample accurate History. which (as far as my Intelligence extends) hath not been assayed to be answered by any *Romanist*.

It may with much more facility be reviled, menaced, than confuted; Invectives, Anathema's are the proper frequent Apologies for Convicted Errors.

With what Truth or Candor, with what strength of Religion or Reason, with what warrant of Piety or Antiquity the Canon of Scripture being there solemnly asserted, universally establisht in all Climates, in all Ages, may in the Sixteenth Century of Christianity be contradicted,

dicted, controuled, condemned by an inconsiderable number of Prelates assembled at *Trent*; some thereof being Titular only; all Homagers of the Papacy entirely swayed, irresistibly influenced from the Conclave at *Rome*. I refer it to all unbyast Intellectuals, to all uncorrupt Judgments to determine.

H. T. *In this Age the* Milevitane *Council defined, That whoever denyed Children newly born to be Baptized; or says, They contract nothing of Original Sin from* Adam, *which may be cleansed by the lavoer of Regeneration*, &c. Anathema.

W. T. I shall not insist upon the inadvertency in point of Chronology, so precisely expressed (in this Age.) Whereas it is recorded in the several Editions of the Councils, and generally by *Annalists* and *Antiquaries*, (*Baronius* not excepted) that this *Milevitan* Council was held in the beginning of a former Century in the time of Pope *Innocentius* the First, betwixt whom and the Fathers of that Synod, there was a Mutual Correspondence of Letters. Were the Date exact for the time, yet was not the Citation apposite for the matter; the Church of *England* solemnly declares what the *Milevitan* Council defines. Articles of Religion, 9. 27.

H. T. *In this Age the* Cæsar Augustan *Council decreed, That Virgins who had vowed themselves to God, should not be vailed till after* 40 *years probation.*

W. T. I acknowledge this to be the last Decree of that Council, and that it was approved by the suffrages of all the Bishops present, all which being computed, were but Twelve. The Inscription of it is, *The* Cæsar Augustan *Council of Twelve Bishops.* So it is set out in the large Editions of the Councils, and in the summary *Caranza.* *Ab universis Episcopis dictum est, Placet.* Const. 2. vol. Edit. Dominic.

If this Decree be of any grand Estimate and Validity why is it receded from, in effect repealed in the Council of *Trent*, that allows Virgins to be Votaries in Vails after Twelve years of Age? Only Abbatisses and Prioresses are limited to the Age of Forty years.) If this be an uncancelled, unvoided Decree alledged, why is it not observed by the *Romanists*? If it be cancelled and voided by them, why is it objected to the Reformed? This is no probate of a Succession, but a Collusion.

Concil. Trident. Sess. 9. Can. 17. Conc. Trident. Sess. 9. can. 7.

H. T. *In this Age Pope* John *the First decreed, That Mass ought not to be celebrated but in places consecrated to our Lord, unless great necessity should enforce it. In his Epistle to the Bishops of divers places, giving this reason, because it is written; See thou offer not thy Holocausts in every place, but in the place which the Lord thy God hath chosen,* Deut. 12. Anno 522. *For as no other but Priests consecrated to our Lord, ought to sing Missæ, and to offer Sacrifices upon our Lord to our Lord upon the Altar, so in no other but consecrated places.* De consecrat. dist. 1. C. Sicut non alii.

W. T. To wave Exceptions as to the Authority of Pope *John* the First (not obligatory) because out of the Verge of his own Jurisdiction) and as to the validity of the proof by a *Mosaical*, Ritual, Ceremonial Institution: I shall only observe, That this is no point contended for. We allow distinct consecrated places and persons. As to the numerous, specious, Testimonies the Instances and Arguments of *H. T.* for this Sixth Century, there is but one, and that misinterpreted (out of the 3d Council of *Carthage*) that hath any affinity to any Controversie betwixt the *Romish* and the Reformed Established Churches; which with the rest, are of no weight to demonstrate the Succession of the one, or to evince that of the other. They may conduce to amuze, to delude an ignorant implicitly devoted Disciple, but cannot convince and satisfie any unprejudiced circumspect Reader.

H. T.

H. T. *Catholick Profeſſors to the Year 600.*

Gerardus, Genovefa, Columbus, Oportuna, Germanus Pariſienſis, Maria *of* Egypt, Brigitta, Simeon Salus, Leander, *St.* Benedict, *(Inſtitutor of the Holy Order of the* Benedictine *Monks)* Rupertus, Maurus, Placidus, Arnulphus, Radegundis Leonard, Columbanus, John Climacus, Iſaac, Herminigildus, Fortunatus, Agricola, Bonifacious, Victor, Eleutherius, Gregorius, Turonenſis, &c.

W. T. Though the purity of Chriſtian Religion ſomewhat declined in this Century, which did not ſhine with ſuch bright Stars of the Church as the two former; yet neither of the Profeſſors recounted by *H. T.* nor other more Illuſtrious commemorated by the Centuriſts of *Magdeburg*, and by *Baronius* in his Annals did aſſert the Religion of the preſent Church of *Rome*, according to the *Trentine* Standard in thoſe Tenents, in which it is oppoſite to the Reformed.

Some of the Profeſſors recited were *Catholicks*, not *Romaniſts*, as *Mary* of *Egypt*, *Brigitta (*of *Scotland.)* Neither the *Egyptian*, nor *Scottiſh* Churches did in this Age own any Homage to the Papal Juriſdiction.

As for St. *Benedict*, (who is ſo diſtinctly ſignalized, as being the Inſtitutor of the Holy Order of the *Benedictines*,) I ſhall not queſtion his Sanctity, it being related by St. *Gregory*, That it was the obloquy of Satan to aſperſe him with the brand of an oppoſite Title, *Maledictus*. Greg. Dial. l. 2. c. 8.

I ſhall grant to St. *Benedict* the due Elogy the Hiſtorian applyes to *Probus*, *Vir ſui nominis*, he did not recede from his own Name, but the preſent *Romaniſts* recede from his Doctrine and Practice.

He did impose upon himself and others Religious Austerities; no Superstitious Cruelties, no Stripes or Manacles.

Monachi moribus ut Eruditione præficiebantur eruditissimi qui non solùm in Divinis docti essent, verùm etiam in Mathematica *Scientia.* Trith. in Chron. Hisang. ad An. 840.

However Sacred and Refined this Order might be in its Primitive Regularity, whilst it was a Seminary of Piety, and Literature of Virtues and Sciences, as *Trithemius* sets it out, who was himself a *Benedictine*, who passionately complained of the degenerate Corruption in later times; for Instance, in the Thirteenth Century. He acknowledges that there was no track of the *Pristine* Institution in the Monasteries of *Germany*; Monks and Abbots rusht to a precipice of Vices.

Monachi simul cum Abbatibus in præcipitium vitiorum Corruerunt. Trith. in Chron. Hisf.

Quàm longè Monachatus hodie a primâ suâ Origine degeneravit, & quantis Abusibus contaminatus & deformatus sit Vitæ sed in

The Learned moderate *Cassander* pathetically resents, deplores the scandalous Monastical Depravations in his Age, notoriously warping from the Original Rectitude, confessing, that there is no footstep (no impression) of a common Canonical Life, Extant but in Fabricks and Names.

satis per se est Manifestum, manent adhuc vestigia Communis & Canonicæ ædificiis ac Nominibus tantum. Cassander, Conf. 5. Art. 25.

The prophaneness of the Monks did render the dissolution of the Monasteries in this Nation more practicable and feasible than otherwise it could possibly have proved.

H. T. *Nations converted, St.* Augustine *the Monk sent by Pope* Gregory, *converted* England. *The* Northern Picts, Goths, Bavarians, *and* Burgundians, *were also converted in this Age.*

W. T. I confess the memory of St. *Austin* the Monk ought to be precious, and celebrated with a grateful respect;

ſpect; but *H. T.* amplifies too much the Orb of this Luminary in aſcribing to this Monk the Converſion of *England*. Chriſtian Religion being publickly profeſt in this Iſland before any other Climate or Countrey in the World; the Goſpel being planted here by *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* in the Reign of *Tiberius*, as 'tis recorded by famous Antiquaries, and even by *Baronius*. How it fructified in ſucceeding Centuries before the Birth of *Auſtin* the Monk is evidenced by the ſolemn Recitals of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Hilary*, and *Chryſoſtome* in their ſeveral Generations, by the Epiſcopal, Archi-Epiſcopal Dignities erected continued, by the Repute and Luſtre of thoſe Prelates in Forreign Councils at *Arles*, at *Sardis*, at *Arimine*, nay at *Nice* it ſelf, the *Britiſh* Biſhops being Zealous Orthodox Sticklers at home and abroad in the Confutation, the Extirpation of *Arrianiſme*.

Britannia *omnium provinciarum prima publicitus Chriſti nomen recepit.* Sabel. Ennead. 7. l.

Gildas Epiſt.

Capgravius in Vitâ Sancti Joſephi.

Pitſæus de Illyr. Script. Covorruvius in Præfat. ad Philipp.

Baron. Annal. Anno 35.

The diſtinct Inſtances are produced by Biſhop Jewel againſt Harding. p. 11.

When St. *Auſtin* the Monk repaired to *England*, his Pious, heroique deſign was prepared and facilitated by the *Britiſh* Chriſtians intermingled with *Pagan Saxons*, tho' the moſt eminent *Britains* took *Wales* for their refuge together with their retinues; yet multitudes of the Conquered remained in *England* diſperſt among the Conquerors.

The Influence of St. *Auſtin* the Monk was in a manner confined to *Kent*, it extended little farther.

Even in *Kent*, *Auſtines* Task wasleſs difficult, being promoted by Queen *Berta*, who made profeſſion of Chriſtian Religion before the Arrival of *Auſtine*, had a Church in *Canterbury* for the Solemnity of Divine Service, had a Biſhop *Luidhard* to preſide in it, a Præcurſor, a Porter to St. *Auſtin* in *Capgraves* Expreſſion.

Luidhardus *Præcurſor & Janitor venturi* Auguſtini. Capgr. in Vitâ Auguſt.

Even *Aidan* and *Finan*, whoſe Names are obſerved in Hiſtories, not flouriſht in the *Romiſh* Calendars, had more numerous Converts in *England* than *Auſtin* himſelf, the Province of their ſucceſsful Doctrines more enlarged.

Beda l. 4. c. 37.

As

As for the ſpecious Relation of the *Northern Picts*, *Gothes*, *Bavarians*, *Burgundians* rallied as converted in this Age, they were Diſciples of *Antioch*, not of *Rome*; they embraced the Evangelical unblemiſht Doctrine; they acknowledged no Papal unlimited Juriſdiction, not challenged in this Age not by *Auſtin* the Monk in his Conference with the *Britiſh* Biſhops and Monks, he cajoled, intreated a Conformity to the Rituals of the *Roman* Church in the Celebration of Baptiſm in the Obſervation of *Eaſter*, he exacted no ſubmiſſion to the Authority, Univerſal Supremacy of that Church. This was reprehended, branded by Pope *Gregory*, whoſe Emiſſary he was, by *Pelagius*, before him in the ſame See of *Rome*, nay by all Predeceſſors, as *Gregory* himſelf atteſts.

Gregor. l. 4. Ep. 36. Diſtinct. 99.

Nullus unquam Prædeceſſorum meorum hujuſmodi tam profano vocabulo (ſcilicet univerſalis Epiſcopus) uti conſuevit. Greg. l. 4. Ep. 36.

Cætera deſiderantur.